ADMINISTRATION OF TOWNS AND MARKETS UNDER THE MUGHALS (1556-1707)

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE
OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN HISTORY

By
MAHENDRA PAL SINGH

Under
PROFESSOR IRFAN HABIB

CENTRE OF ADVANCED STUDY
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY
ALIGARH
1973

A B S T R A C T

The present thesis, 'Administration of Towns and Markets under The Mughals' (1556-1707) is an attempt to study the working of the Mughal administration of towns and markets. Before studying the administrative structure, a survey is offered of the towns of the Mughal Empire, studying the factors behind their origins and growth. We have also discussed their functional roles; lay out and fortification, its significance and the urban population.

Chapter II deals with internal administration; the <u>Kotwāl</u> (the principal police and executive official), his duties, his establishment and his jurisdiction in relation to those of the <u>qāzī</u> and the <u>muhtasib</u>.

Chapter III examines the duties and responsibility of such officials as <u>faujdār</u>, <u>qilʿadār</u>, <u>thānadār</u>, <u>muhtasib</u> and <u>waqāʾinavīs</u> who in various ways were concerned with maintenance of law and order and other matters affecting the administration of towns, including their defence.

Chapter IV describes the duties and jurisdiction of the <u>qāzī</u> and other officials of the judicial department.

The fiscal administration of the towns is discussed in Chapter V, covering such themes as the fiscal divisions

(*mahāls*) of the town, taxes and taxable items, officials in various *mahāls*; custom *chaukis* (*nākas*) and the position of towns held in *Jāgīr*.

Chapter VI discusses various types of markets (*bāzārs*) their organisation, officials and such personages as *chaudharis* and *dallāls*. Special attention is paid to the problem of market prices and their manipulation.

Chapter VII is devoted to the institution of mint (*dārulzarb*). It describes the principal mint officials, craftsmen and mint charges. It also discusses the importance of sarrāfs (shroffs) as intermediaries between the mint and the public.

The last chapter deals with port administration. It discusses in detail the functions and powers of the *mutasaddi*, the *Shāhbandar*, duties of other officials and the *piyādas* posted at the port town and at custom house. It further studies the organisation of the *mahāl farza* (custom house), the *mahāl khushki* (check post for inland trade) and the *mahāl jahāzāt* (harbours), custom dues, anchorage fee (*haq-i langar*), and farming (*ijāra*) of the port.

These chapters are followed by a summary and some conclusions drawn from our information.

There are two appendices. Appendix I lists the active mints, under Akbar, Jahāngīr, Shāhjahān and Aurangzeb separately for gold, silver and copper. Appendix II gives a chronogical list of the mutasaddīs of the port of Sūrat during 1608-1711.

P R E F A C E

This thesis, as the title chosen indicates, proposes to study the working of the Mughal administration at the town and market level. The subject has hitherto not been adequately dealt with. The pioneering works of Mr.Moreland, Professor Sarkar and Dr. P.Saran have covered , but only partly, some of the aspects studied. However, without those studies, the present attempt could not have been made.

I have tried to rely principally upon the large amount of documentary material now available mainly in Persian, and on such works as the Āīn-i Akbarī, the Mirāt-i Ahmadī, the Mazhar-i Shāhjahānī and large number of Dastūr-ul 'Amals. But chronicles and European Travellers accounts have been used extensively. I have sought to study, first, the Mughal India town as a social and economic unit, before studying its administration. I have tried to analyse separately the law and order and fiscal aspects of town administration. The other institutions studied are : markets, mints and ports. The period I am concerned with is 1556-1707. However, since the evidence from the early 16th and the later 18th centuries are freely cited the above date limit should not be taken too literally.

It is my pleasant duty to acknowledge the guidance, help and support which I received, while writing this thesis, from my teachers, colleagues and those who are next to me. First of all, I wish to record my grateful thanks to Professor

Irfan Habib, under whose guidance this study was undertaken. Of his time and talents, he has given very liberally indeed. His criticism, suggestions and encouragement have been invaluable to the completion of this study. I have also greatly benefitted from the discussions I have had with my colleague, Mr. A.Jan Qaisar; and to Dr. K.D.Swaminathan I owe a number of invaluable suggestions. I am thankful to both. I am also thankful to Professor S.Nurul Hasan and Professor K.A.Nizami who helped me in various ways.

I am beholden to the staff of the Maulānā Āzād Library and the Department of History Library, A.M.U., the staff of the National Archives, Delhi, the Bīkāner and Allāhābād Archives and the Bhāratī Itihās Samsodhak Mandal, Poona, for their assistance. I am thankful to Mr. Azmatullah, the typist and to Mr. Ram Jeet, who helped me in many ways. Finally, I am grateful to my wife for correcting a portion of the type-script and helping to prepare appendix No.I.

The errors that remain are mine.

MAHENDRA PAL SINGH

Department of History
A.M.U.Aligarh.

C O N T E N T S

			Page
Chapter I	:	THE TOWNS	 1
Chapter II	:	KOTWĀL HIS DUTIES AND CHABUTRA-I KOTWĀLĪ	 48
Chapter III	:	OTHER EXECUTIVE OFFICIALS	 95
Chapter IV	:	JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE TOWNS	 120
Chapter V	:	FISCAL ADMINISTRATION	 161
Chapter VI	:	MARKET ADMINISTRATION	 179
Chapter VII	:	THE MINTS	 211
Chapter VIII	:	PORT ADMINISTRATION	 241
SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS			 278

Appendices:

I.	ACTIVE MINT TOWNS	 296
II.	MUTASADDĪS AT THE PORT OF SŪRAT (17th c.)	 306

B I B L I O G R A P H Y 316

ABBREVIATIONS

Ahwāl	.....	Ahwāl-i Shaher Akbarābād
Āīn	.....	Āīn-i-Akbari
Akhbārāt	.....	Akhbārāt-i Darbār-i Muallā
Ans.	.....	Annas
A.D.Albuquerque	.....	The Commentarios do Grande Afonso de Albuquerque.
Badāonī	.....	Muntakhab ut Tawārīkh
Barbosa	.....	The Book of Duarte Barbosa
Barnī	.....	Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī
Bāyazīd	.....	Tazkira-i Humāyūn o Akbar
Bernier	.....	Travels in the Mughal Empire (1656-60).
Bowrey	.....	A Geographical Account of Countries Round the Bay of Bengal.
Carèri	.....	The Indian Travels of Thevenot and Careri.
D.	.....	Dām.
De laet	.....	The Empire of the Great Mogol, S.N.Banerjee.
EF	.....	The English Factories
Embassy	.....	The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe
Elkington	.....	Elkington's notes, Supplementary Calendar of Documents in the India Office.
Fryer	.....	A New Account of East India, etc. (1672-81).
Hamilton	.....	A New Account of the East Indies.
Herbert	.....	Some Years Travels into Divers parts of Asia and Africa.

IESHR	.....	The Indian Economic & Social Historical Review.
IHRC	.....	Indian Historical Record Commission.
Iqbālnāma	.....	Iqbālnāma-i Jahāngīrī
Jagjībandās	.....	Muntakhab-ut Tawārīkh
Jagat Rāī	.....	Farhang-i Kārdānī
Jauhar	.....	Tazkirat al Wāqiʻāt
Jawāhar Nāth Bekās	.....	Dastūr al ʻAmal
JASB	.....	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
JESHO	.....	Journal of the Economic & Social History of the Orient.
J.	.....	Jital.
John Van Twist) or) J.Van Twist)	.....	A General Description of India
~~Joseph Salbancke~~	.....	Voyage
J.Olafsson	....	The Life of the Iceland(-er) Olafsson.
Kāghazāt Mutafarriqa	.....	MS. Add. 6586.
Khāfī Khān.	.....	Muntakhab-al Lubāb
Khwāja Yāsīn	.....	Glossary
Khutūt Ahlkārān) Khutūt Mahārājgan)	.....	Documents from Bikāner Archives.
Mandelslo	.....	Travel in Western India.Commissariat.
Manrique	.....	Travels
Manucci	.....	Storia do Mogor.
Martin R.Montgomery	.....	The History,Antiquities, Topography and Statistics of Eastern India.
Marshall	.....	Notes & Observation on East India.

M.	.....	*Māsha*
Master	.....	*Diaries*
Mirāt	.....	*Mirāt-i Ahmadī*
Mirāt (Suppl.)	.....	*Mirāt-i Ahmadī Khātima*
Monserrate	.....	*Commentary*
MS.Fraser 86	.....	*Dastūr-al 'Amal* (Aurangzeb)
MS. Fraser 124	.....	*Tasnif-i I'timād 'Alī Khān - Iqbālnāma Wa Akhbārnāma.*
Mundy	.....	*Travels.*
Mutafarriq Mahārājgan / *Mutafarriq Ahlkārān*	.....	Documents from Bikāner Archives.
Nicholas Dawton	.....	*The Voyage.*
Nicolo Conti	.....	*The Travels.*
NS.	.....	*Numismatic Supplement*
Ovington	.....	*A Voyage to Surat.*
Pādshāhnāma	.....	'Abdul Hamīd Lahorī
P.Saran	.....	*The Provincial Government of the Mughals.*
Ps.	.....	*Paisa*
Pelsaert	.....	*Jahangir's India*
Pietro Della Valle or P.D.Valle	.....	*The Travels.*
Pieter Van Den Broeke	.....	*Surat Diary*
Peter Floris	.....	*His Voyage to the East Indies in the Globe.*
Ralph Fitch	.....	*Narrative*
Rs.	.....	Rupees
Steingass	.....	*Comprehensive Persian English Dictionary.*

Sujān Rāi	.....	<u>Khulāsatut Tawārīkh</u>
S.	.....	<u>Surkh</u>
<u>Tabaqāt</u>	.....	<u>Tabaqāt-i Akbarī</u>
Tavernier	.....	<u>Travels in India</u>
Thevenot	.....	<u>The Indian Travels of Thevenot & Careri.</u>
Thomas Best	.....	<u>The Voyage.</u>
T.	.....	<u>Tola</u>
<u>Tuzuk</u>	.....	<u>Tuzuk-i Jahangiri</u>
Urdū Z.Q.	.....	Urdū Ẓafar Qarīn
<u>Vakīl Report</u>	.....	Documents from Bikāner Archives.
Wilson	.....	<u>Glossary</u>

N O T E

The transliteration of Persian words and names is based on the system adopted by Steingass in his _Persian English Dictionary_.

CHAPTER I

THE TOWNS

Persian historians of the period present very simple classification of the towns (or cities). They mention only two categories based either on size and population or on administrative status (whether Imperial or provincial capitals, sarkār or pargana headquarters). There is first the simple division of towns into big and small. The word balda (or occasionally shahr) is generally employed for a big town[1] (or, as in English, one may say, city), and qasba for a township.[2] For the big and small ports they use the terms, respectively, bandar and bāra.[3] However, there were some common features in all towns : first, a permanent market (bāzār),[4] second, the inhabitants being non-agriculturalists.[5] The towns were centres of commerce and crafts.[6] Easy availability of water, from a river[7] or artificial reservoir,[8]

---

1. Ā'īn, II, p.240; Sujān Rāi, pp. 38,39,42,53; Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī, p.33; Mir'āt (Suppl.), pp. 11-12; Dastūr, MS. Fraser, 86, ff.21ab, 22ab, 23ab; Iqbālnāma, p.115; Pādshāh-nāma, I, p.166; Tuzuk, p.210.

2. Dastūr-al-Albāb fi 'ilm al-hisāb, f.20b; Khwāja Yāsīn, f.75b; Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, II, pp. 494-95; Ā'īn, I, p.434; Sujān Rāi, pp. 38-39-53; Imperial Farmān (1577 to 1805 A.D.) K.M.Jhaveri, p.72, F.N.No.4; The Mughals and the Jogis, p.161, F.N.No.6; B.R.Grover, Raqba Bandi Document, IHRC XXXVI, part, III, p.59.
3. Mirāt, (Suppl.) pp. 205,222,239-40; MS. Fraser 124, f.113b.

4. Sarkar, Mughal Administration, p.209; See the document No.XIII, The Mughals and the Jogis, p.167.

5. Ā'īn, II, p.240; Pelsaert, p.8; Thevenot, p.47; Hamilton, p.317; Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, p.94; Akbarnāma, II, p.356; Mundy, II, pp.207-208.

Contd......

was another requirement. Fourth, fortification comprising a castle within[1] and an outer enclosing wall, whether of mud or bricks,[2] surrounded by a deep trench[3] and fifth, administrative headquarters.[4] In case of the major ports (bandars), in addition to the above features, access to the open sea, either through a harbour, or a creek or estuary, was essential,

---

(Continued from the previous page)

6. Akbarnāma, II, p.366; Waqā'i'-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 94, 317; Thevenot, p.47; Pelsaert, p.9.

7. For majority of the towns or cities which were situated on river banks, see Ā'īn, I, pp. 486, 434, 456, 423, 537; Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī, pp. 3, 33, 57; Thevenot, p.97; Finch, Early Travels, pp. 176-77.

8. The towns, which were at some distance from the rivers, for the supply of water had tanks, reservoirs, wells and bāolīs. See Akbarnāma, II, p.357; Tabaqāt, p.289: For a great tank at Ajmer, which was perhaps the only big city having no river supply of water. Mundy, II, p.31; Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt, p.20.

1. Mir'āt (Suppl.), p.222; Badāonī, II, p.251; Tavernier, I, p.116; Finch, Early Travels, p.144; Thevenot, pp.80-81.

2. EF (1622-23), p.239; Akhbārāt, document No.165, dated 2nd Rajab, 1123 A.H; Khutūt Ahlkārān, document No.1257, undated; Thevenot, p.11; Pelsaert, pp.42-43; Mundy, II, p.270; Manrique, II, p.261.

3. Mundy, II, p.29; Finch, Early Travels, p.185; Ibid., pp. 170-171.

4. All big and small towns were administrative headquarters.

where big ships could approach and anchor.[1] The bāra[2] had its connection with the high sea through a smaller river, through which small boats alone could have access.

FUNCTIONAL BASIS OF TOWNS:

Viewed from a functional point of view, the towns of the Mughal Empire fell into various categories. The towns which were administrative headquarters such as Imperial[3] or provincial capitals[4] and sarkār or pargana headquarters[5] may

1. Mir'āt (Suppl.), p. 239.

2. Ibid.

3. Āgra, Delhi (occasionally Lāhore, Burhānpūr and 'Aurangābād).

4. Provincial capitals: In 1580 there were 12 provincial capitals later on, with the annexation of Berār, Khāndesh and Ahmandnagar the number rose to 15. See Ā'īn, I, 386. At close of 20th year of Shāhjahān the Empire contained 22 sūbahs and hence 22 provincial capitals, see Pādshāhnāma, II, p.710. Under Aurangzeb the number of provincial capitals continued 22, see Zawābit-i-'Ālamgīrī, FF.4ab, 5ab, 6ab.

5. Number of sarkārs and parganas at different periods:

Year	Sarkār	Pargana	
1580	105	2737	- See Ā'īn, I, p.386.
1594	123	3117	- See Ibid.
1647		4350	- See Pādshāhnāma, II, p.710.
1669	157)	)	
1720	196)	4716)	- See Sarkar, India of Aurangzeb, p. xxvi.

be said to have formed one category. These towns were primarily meant for administration but subsequently they also became busy centres of commerce and crafts.[1] The presence of Imperial court, large number of nobles, their retainers, the army and the administrative staff attracted craftsmen and merchants in large numbers. Once commerce and industry were established, such towns survived or prospered even when they ceased to be administrative centres.[2] The examples of Āgra, after 1638, and of Shāhjahānābād,[3] after 1679, may be cited.

The second category comprised towns which developed as commercial and industrial centres first and later on became administrative headquarters. Patna, to begin with, was merely a <u>mahāl</u> headquarters,[4] but later on when it became a great commercial centre, controlling the trade between Bengāl and the rest of the northern India, its administrative

---

1. Thevenot, pp. 49-50; Pelsaert, p.37; Finch, <u>Early Travels</u>, pp. 17-18; <u>Tabaqāt</u>, II, pp. 338-339; Mundy, II, 207-208; <u>Akbarnāma</u>, II, pp. 356.

2. H.K.Naqvi, p.269.

3. Richard Steel & Crowther, p.267, speaking about Delhi (1616) the author says,...... "the inhabitants (for the most Baniāns) poore and beggerly, by reason of the kings long absence." Speaking about Fatehpur Sikri, Thevenot remarks, "Fatehpur Sikri became deserted when Royal seat moved to Āgra." Thevenot, p.66.

4. <u>Ā'īn</u>, I, p.418.

status was raised and it was made the provincial capital of Bihār.[1]

The third category comprised manufacturing towns, such as those noticed in the provinces of Gujarāt[2] and Bengāl,[3]

---

1. Patna, then Patliputra, achieved eminence as early as the Mauryan rule in 4th century B.C. But later on it suffered a decline and from an Imperial capital it became reduced to a small town. By the beginning of the 17th century it was made the provincial capital, a position which it is still retaining. See Chār Chaman, f.59a. Sujān Rāi, p.35. Tavernier, I, p.122; about Patna Manrique says, "This city is so populous that .... it contained over two hundred thousand inhabitants, irrespective of the great number of strangers who were drawn there by its vast trade, and also from its being one of the biggest towns in the whole Mogol Empire .... the trade was so great that it contained over six hundred brokers and middlemen engaged in commerce, all of whom derived such great profits from their labour that most of them were wealthy men." See Manrique, II, p.140; Finch, Early Travels, pp. 23-24.

2. The important manufacturing towns in the province of Gujarat were: Ahmadābād, Baroda, Broach, Camboy, Sūrat, Rander, Nadiād, Muhammadābād, Gobay, Gundevī, Nausārī, Dabhoi etc.

3. In Bengal : Kāsimbāzār, Mālda, Dacca, Huglī, Rajmahal, Murishidābād, Cushādānga-near Hugli, Shahbāzpūr, Sonārgāon, Ghorāghāt-famous for silk and jute, Bārbakābād, Bāzuhā, Silhat, Dalight, Māsūmābāzār etc. Mention also may be made of Patna in Bihār and Bālāsore in Orissa. Manucci perhaps rightly pointed out that the bulk of the merchandise that was exported from the Mughal Empire was derived from four kinds of plants viz., the cotton herb, the indigo plant, the poppy plant and the mulberry -tree on which silk worms were fed (See Manucci, II, p.418). The cultivation of the first two plants was mainly confined to Gujarāt. The third about Patna and also in Bengāl and the fourth plant particularly in Bengāl. It was for this very reason that the manufacture of cotton goods and indigo was confined to Gujarāt because the raw material was cheap and readily available. While the silk goods and opium were the monopoly of Bengāl.

during the 17th century, such towns acquired reputation for manufacturing specific goods. The arrival of European trading companies in the Indian waters and the increasing demand for Indian manufactures i.e. the cotton cloth, raw silk and silk clothes, ~~shaz~~ in European markets and in Asian countries was perhaps a new factor for the growth of the towns that became manufacturing centres, for cotton textiles, around Sūrat[1] and for silk and cotton goods, around Dācca and Huglī.[2] It is significant that a large part of

---

1. For cotton clothes of various sorts for instance at Ahmadābād, the cloth of gold tissue, chirah (coloured turban), fotah (loinband), Jamahwar (flowered woollen stuff), velvet, brocade, silk, cloth, and Khāra (undulated silk-cloth), were well woven there. See Sujān Rāi p.66, EF, (1661-64), p.200. About Broach, Pelsaert, p.43; The towns Nadiād and Muhammadābād between Baroda and Ahmadābād producing cotton-thread, Thevenot, p.46. Gundevī and Nausārī producing the best calico and linen, see EF, (1637-41), p.166; Baroda, see Tavernier, Vol. I, p.71. Letter's Received, I pp. 305-306; EF, (1646-50), pp.188-189. Cambay-famous for quilts, carpets and convas, See Letters' Received, III, p.32, Dabhoi-a town fifteen miles south-east of Baroda was famous for cotton clothes, see EF, (1622-23), pp.99-100. Sobay-a town near Sūrat famous for Calico and cotton clothes, see Purchase, III, p.82.

2. For Dacca, see Hamilton, p.416. For Malda, see Master, I p.398; Hamilton, p.414. For Kāsimbāzār, see Tavernier, II, pp. 2-3; Court Minutes (1668-70) p.102; Bernier, p. 440. Master, I, p.448. For Bālighāt and Masūmābāzār, see Manrique, II, pp.117-118. For Murishidābād, see Mundy, II, p.371. For Cushādānga near Hugli, see Marshall, p.66. For Shāhabāzār and Sonārgāon, see Pelsaert, p.8. For Rajmahal, see Master, I, pp.399-400. For Ghorāghāt, Barbakābād, Bazuha and Silhat, see A'In, I, p.390.

the population in these towns consisted of weavers.[1] We may similarly categorise towns such as Khairābād,[2] Daryābād,[3] Lucknow[4] and Samāna,[5] which were famous for calicoes known after their names.

---

1. For weavers constituting the majority of town inhabitants at Broach and Baroda see EF, (1630-33) p.22. Speaking about Broach Hamilton says, "it is now inhabited by weavers and fuch mechanicks as manufacture cotton cloth." See Hamilton, pp. 314-316. "The town depends on the weaving industry, says Pelsaert about Broach, "and produces the best known fine baftees." See Pelsaert, p.43; Sobay was also full of spinners and weavers. See Purchas III, p.82; Kāsimbāzār full of silk weavers, see Court Minutes (1668-70), p.102. Speaking about Shāhbāzār and Sonārgaon, Pelsaert says, "all live by the weaving industry." See p.8. About Rajmahal, see Master, I, pp.399-400.

2. For Khairābādī (Cotton Textile), see EF, (1637-41), p.192; Ibid. (1642-45) pp. 6-7.

3. Dariyābādī, see EF (1637-41), p.278; Ibid., (1655-60), p.270; Ibid. (1637-41), p.312; Ibid., (1642-45) p.204; Ibid., (645-51) pp. 2,28; Ibid (1651-54), p.52; Ibid., (1655-60), p.70. Fabrics from the above places were so much in demand among the Europeans that they acquired their names after the places of their manufacturing.

4. Pelsaert, p.7; EF (1642-45), p.6.

5. The cotton cloths manufactured at Samāna were knowns as Semānian or Semianos see Embassy, II, 447; EF (1618-21), p.161; Ibid., p.61; Ibid., (1637-41), p.134.

Then, there were towns which acquired reputation for the agricultural produce of the particular areas. Mention in this regard may be made of Biāna,[1] Sarkhej,[2] Khurja[3] for supplying almost the entire quota of indigo exported from India. Out of the above places Biāna (near Āgra) and Sarkhej (near Ahmadābād) furnished the best indigo.

The fifth category was of those towns which were situated either on the banks of the navigable rivers[4] or on Imperial highways.[5] The constant inflow of merchant

---

1. Indigo at Biāna, see Ā'īn, I, p.442; Sujān Rāi, p.40; Mundy, II, p.222; EF, '24" p.335; J. Salbancke, p.84.

2. Indigo at Sarkhej see Ā'īn, I, p.486; EF (1646-50), p.305; Ibid., (1634-36), p.23; Ibid., (1624-29), p.38; Ibid., 232.

3. See Tavernier, Vol. II, pp. 8-9; EF (1655-60), p.18.

4. The navigable rivers were: the Indus the Ganges, the Jamuna, the Brahmaputra together with their branches and tributaries in Northern India and in South the Godāvarī, the Krishna, the Cāvery, the Narbada and the Tāptī. The rivers of the north were navigable over the large tracts from one end to the other and during all the seasons of the year. While the rivers of the south could be used to a lesser degree and over considerably smaller areas, running as they do over rocks and valleys. See Inland Transport and Communication, p.1.

5. The Chahār Gulshan, mentions 24 roads leading to various directions. They were: (1) Āgra to Delhi, (2) Delhi to Lāhore (3) Lāhore to Gujarāt-Attak (4) Attak to Kābul (5) Kābul to Ghaznī-Qandahār, (6) Gujarāt to Srinagar, (7) Lāhore to Multān, (8) Delhi to Ajmer, (9) Delhi to Bareli-Banāres-Patna, (10) Delhi to Kol (Aligarh), (11) Āgra to Allāhābād, (12) Bījāpūr to Ujjain, (13) Sironj to Narwar, (14) Aurangābād to Ujjain (15) Golkunda to Āsir-Hindia (16) Hindia to Sironj (17) Narwar to Gwāliar-Dholpūr, (18) Dholpūr to Āgra (19) Multān to Bhakkar

Contd......

caravans, both by land and water, which passed through them, contributed to their rise and growth.[1] These towns were emporia of goods and merchandise. Their proximity to trade routes was sufficient to induce the manufacturers and producers to bring their goods in the mandis (markets) of these towns where a big merchant or a caravan might arrive to purchase the whole stock; and, secondly, the presence of large number of buyers offered prospects of higher prices.[2]

(Continued from the previous page)

(20) Srinagar to Attack (21) Ajmer to Ahmadābād, (22) Surkhāb to Kābul (23) Qandahār to Multān (24) Qandahār to Attak, see Chahār Gulshan, ff. 142a-b, 143a-b, 144a-b, 145a-b. & 146a-b. According to Prof. Sarkar "out of the 24 roads, 13 above are traceable either fully or in great part. Of the remaining 11, a few of the stages have been identified, but they do not enable us to trace accurately the alignment of these high wayes." See India of Aurangzeb, p.xcvi. For the route from Āgra to Patna see Mundy, II, pp.78-137; Mundy travelled through this way in 1632. See also Marshall, pp. 159-160, for the routes Delhi to Patna, Patna to Bālāsore, Patna to Nepāl, Bhūtān and Tibet. For Surat Āgra route via Burhānpūr and via Ahmadābād, Mundy, II, pp. 225-276.

1. Manrique, II, pp.221,223,232 & 233; Early Travels, Finch, p.161; EF (1634-36) pp, 129-130; Pelsaert, p.37; Tavernier, I, pp. 61-62; Mundy, ii, p.271; Hamilton, p.304.

2. For the situation of Balighāt and Ma'sūmābāzār (in Bengāl) lying on either of the banks of Ganges and full of both provision and merchandise, see Manrique, II, pp.117-118. For Sārang on way from Ahmadābād to Surat, Mundy ii, p.271. For Cambay between Ahmadābād and Surat, Tavernier, I, pp. 68-69. Narwar on the route from Burhānpūr to Āgra, Tavernier, I, pp. 61-62. Thatta, Early Travels, Withington pp. 217-18, Hamilton, p.304. For Burhānpūr, Pelsaert, p.37. Sidhpūr, Tavernier, I, p.80; Thevenot, p.56. Nadiād and Muhammadābād (between Baroda and Ahmadābād), Thevenot, p. 46; Mālda, Hamilton, p.56; Master, I, p.398. Multān, Tavernier, I, pp.90-91; Palsaert, p.31. For Bhakkar see EF, (1634-36), pp. 129-30. Sahwān, Mazhar-i-Shāh Jahānī, p. 111. For Bahrāich which was situated on Patna-Tibet road:

Contd.....

A few towns belonging to this category were: Thaṭṭa, Bhakkar, Lāhore, Dholpūr, Gwāliar, Narwar, Sirong, Handiya, Burhānpūr, Hindaun, Ajmer, Merta, Sirohi, Sidhpūr, Aḥmadābād, Muḥammadābād, Broach, Allāhābād, Patna, Bahrāich. For the rise and growth of most of these towns, the proximity to trade routes was, in comparision to other things, a leading factor.

Again, there were the port-towns on the western coast and around the Bay of Bengal. The important among them, belonging to the Mughals, were Lāhorī-bandar, Gogha, Cambay, Broach, Sūrat, and Swālly on the Western coast;[1] and Satgāon, Huglī,

(Continued from the previous page)

to which quantities of goods from the northern mountains were carried on the backs of men, of stout ponies and of goats, such as gold, copper, lead, musk, tails of the Kutas cow, honey, pomegranate, seeds, wollen stuffs, wooden ware, hawks, falcons, black-falcons, merlins, and other articles. In exchange they carried back white and coloured clothes, amber, salt, asafoetida, ornaments, glass and earthen ware etc. Ā'īn, I, p.434; also Khulāsatul Hind, p.49.

1. There were 27 ports and 45 baras in the province of Gujarāt alone. See Mir'āt, (Suppl.) p.239. For Lāhorī bandar, see EF, (1634-36), pp. 123n, 124, 139; Aurangzeb is accredited to have opened this new port at the month of Indus in 1661. See Ibid.,(1651-60), p.10; Ādāb-i-'Ālamgīrī, f.6a. Prof. Sarkar is inclined to regard it (Lāhorī bandar) as Shāhbandar see History of Aurangzeb, I, p.124. For Gogha, Cambay, Broach, Rander, and Sūrat see Ā'īn, I, pp.486, 487, 488. In the MS. Fraser 124, there is mention of 20 ports of Hindūstān and on western coast in addition to the ports above mentioned, the ports Gandhār, Swālly, Pattan, Porbander, Mangrol, Kalyān and Danda Rājpurī are also mentioned, f. 113b.

Sripūr, Chittagong, Piplī, Haripūr (or Harīharpūr), Bālāsore, etc., on the Bay of Bengāl.[1] In the 16th century a few of them were important centres of sea-borne trade. Mention in this regard may be made of Cambay,[2] Rander,[3] Satgāon,[4] Huglī,[5] Piplī[6] and Chittagong.[7]

---

1. For the ports in and around Bay of Bengāl. See Mundy II, pp.151,152; A'In, I, pp.388,391; Sonargāon port is mentioned in Akbarnāma, III, pp.437-439; Marshall, pp. 68,61,108; Tārikh-i-Bengāla, f.27b; [redacted], MS.Fraser, 124, f. 113b.

2. See Akbarnāma, III, p.9; when Akbar visited Cambay he found there merchants of Rum, Syria, Persia, Turān etc. Pelsaert, pp. 19-20; The Abbecarre, I, p.138; Tuzuk, p. 204; Careri, p.164.

3. Mir'āt, (Suppl.), p.222. Daurte Barbosa who visited Sūrat and Rander in the early 16th century found Sūrat inferior to Rander, I, p.149; History of Gujarāt, I, p. 266; Gujarāt-State Gazetteer Surat, District, p.82, A'In I, p.488; Tārikh-i-Bengāla, f.29a.

4. A'In, I, p.391; Pādshāhnāma, I, p.434; Caesar Frederick, III, p.114.

5. Manrique, ii, p.392; Marshall, p.65; Mundy, ii, p.152, n.3; EF, (1622-23), pp. 213-214; Pādshāhnāma, I, p.434.

6. Hamilton, p.407; Marshall, p.108.

7. A'In, I, pp. 388, 391; Mundy, ii, pp. 152-53; Caesar Frederick, Vol. III, p.260.

None of the travellers during the 16th century mentions Sūrat as a big emporium of international fame.[1] It was only when the English, the Dutch and the French disembarked there and established trading companies and regular fleet started coming to and going back ladden with Indian goods to Europe and elsewhere, that commercial activities gained momentum and Sūrat excelled Rander and Cambay.[2] Similarly Huglī, which owed much to the Portuguese for its development as a port,[3] acquired prominence after 1632 when other European nations had arrived in Bengāl waters.[4] It had earlier eliminated the old port of Satgāon.[5]

Another category consisted of those towns which were pilgrim centres, having sacred spots.[6] A number of them were

---

1. Duarte Barbosa, I, pp.149-146-48. According to Barbosa the rise of Sūrat could be traced from 1530 when Rander a neighbouring port was sacked by the Portuguese. Sūrat too was attacked but it soon recored, see Ibid., p.148.

2. Letters Received, IV, pp.151-153; EF, (1618-21) pp.24,30 & 13; Hamilton, p.313. One of the main reason why Sūrat superseded Cambay, a port of universal renown in the 15th and 16th centuries, was that Cambay had no good harbour of its own. It presented a number of navigational hazards for the vessels coming to it and it was for this reason that Gogha used to serve Cambay as anchorage.

3. For the History of Huglī, see Manrique, I, pp.27-29; Pādshāhnāma, I, p.434; Khāfī Khān, I, p.468.

4. See Master, II, pp. 79-80. In the year 1632, Huglī was captured by the Mughals, Pādshāhnāma, I, p.434; see also J.A.S.B., Vol.No.11, p.600.

5. A'in, I, p.391; Pādshāhnāma, I, p.434; Tārīkh-i-Bangāla, f. 29a.

6. The important pilgrim centres were: Benāres, Mathura,

Contd.....

situated on the banks of holy rivers.[1] In this case their

(Continued from the previous page)

Prayāga (Allāhābād), Hardwār, Thānesar, Gayā, Ayodhyā, Nagarkot, Jagannāth, Surajkund, Ujjain, Kannauj, Dvaraka, Kānchī, Kashmīr etc. for details, see A'īn, I, pp.423,442, 515,455,538,334,433; Ibid, II, pp. 178-179; Tabaqāt, p. 267; Early Travels, Finch, p.176; Ibid., p.20; Careri, p.262; Tavernier, I, p.118. For Mathura and Gokul, see The Eng.Fact. (1665-60), p.69. For Benares, see Ardhā Kathānak, p.1; Akbarnāma, III, pp. 415-416; Khulāsat-ul-Hind, pp.47, 48,55,56 & 45; Mannucci, II, p.76; Sujān Rāi, pp. 42,43, 41,40. To these may be added the shrines dedicated to Asurās. Most of these temples are in south. Next there were shrines of the great Rishīs. They were more then thousand. Prominent amongthese were Nimkhār Pukhrā (or Pushkarā) Khushāb (or Joshī Math) and Badrī-nāth. Next were the shrines called Manusha, or pertaining to men who by their power of good works were superior to mankind in general. Their temples were numerous. Among them Kurukshetra was most prominent, which for forty kos around was considered holy and pilgrims resorted there during eclipses of the sun and moon. See A'īn, II, pp. 179-180.

1. According to the A'īn, the holy places were of four degrees The first was termed deva or divine and dedicated to Brahma, Vishnu and Mahādeva. The greater among these were twenty-eight rivers; Ganges, Sarasvati, Jamuna, Narbada, Vipāsa, Vitāsa, Kauśiki, Nandevati Chenab (or Chandrābhaga), Surāu, Satyāvati, Tapi, Pārāvati, pāsāvati, Gomati, Gundaki, Bahuda, Devika, Godāvari, Tamrāparni, Charmanvati, Varana, Irāvati, (or Rāvi) Satadru (or Sutlej) Bhimārathi (or Bhima), Parnāsona, Vanjāra and Achamiyya. See A'īn, ii, pp. 177-178; Alberunī, Sachau's tr. I, pp.257-262. Some included the Indus, but it was not of the same sanctity. Each of these rivers dedicated to one of these deities, had peculiar characteristics ascribed to it : Some of the places situated on their banks were esteemed holy, as for example the village of Soron on the Ganges (in sarkār Kol), to which multitudes flocked on the twelfth of the month of Āghan. Some regarded certain cities as dedicated to the divinity. Among these was Kāsi commonly called Benāres. The adjacent country for five kos around the city was held sacred and one who died there attained mukti. The other cities, which were held in veneration for the sacred soil around them were: Ayodhyā (forty kos to the east, and twenty to the north

Contd......

sanctity and proximity to rivers ([redacted] Ganges and [redacted],etc.) combined to facilitate commercial intercourse; and the constant influx of pilgrims attracted merchants and craftsmen and labourers from far and near adding to their size and trade.[1]

The last category was of those towns which rose to prominence because of their strategic position and were therefore militarily, as well as, [redacted] commercially important. The towns of Kābul and Qandahār furnish the best examples.[2] They were the 'two gateways of Hindūstān', commanding to two routes, one leading to central Asia and the other to Persia.[3] The position on the regular land routes enabled them to became international markets where merchants of diverse nationalities

---

(Continued from the previous page)

was regarded as sacred ground); Āvantika (Ujjain) all around it for thirty-two kos; Kānchi-for twenty kos around; Mathura-sacred for forty-eight kos around. Dwāraka-forty kos in length and twenty in breadth was esteemed holy; Hardwār-held sacred for eighteen kos. Prayāga venerated for twenty kos around. Nagarkot for eight kos; Kashmīr also belonged to this category. See Ā'īn, II, pp. 178-179.

1. EF, (1655-60), p.69; Early Travels, Finch pp. 20,176; Tavernier, I, p.118; Ā'īn, I, 423; Thevenot, p.97. Ā'īn II, p.179; Ibid., I, p.417.

2. Ā'īn, I, p.592.

3. Ibid.

met and transacted business.[1] Merchant caravans "to Kabul", says Babur, "come from Kashghar, Farghana, Turkistan, Samarkand, Bukhara, Balkh Hisar and Badakhshan. To Qandahar they come from Khurasan."[2] "Kabul is an excellent trading centre, if merchants went to Khita (northern China) or Rum (Turkey), they might make no higher profit. Down to Kabul every year 7,8 or 10000 horses and up to it, from Hindustan, come every caravans of 10,15 or 20000 heads of horses, bring slaves (barda), white cloth, sugar-candy, refined and common sugars and aromatic roots. Many a trader is not content with a profit of 30,40 on 10 (300% or 400%). In Kabul can be had the products of Khurasan, Rum, Iraq and China."[3] At Qandahar too the trade prospects were no small, the city was very big and so were its suburbs because of frequent passage of caravans.[4] Provisions and victuals were in great abundance. If one was ready to travel beyond the town then the profit was no less than 20%.[5]

---

1. Baburnama, f. 168b.

2. Ibid., f. 169a.

3. Baburnama, f. 169a.

4. Richard Steel & J.Crowther, pp. 272-273; Joseph Salbancke, p.85; Thevenot, p.79.

5. Manrique, II, p. 262; Thevenot, p.79. During the 16th century the Portuguese atrocities on the high sea and the closing of the Ormuz route immensely augmented the trade which passed through Qandahar. Although at the opening of the 17th century the sea borne trade struck a severe blow to the land route trade passing through Qandahar, nevertheless, this route never witnessed total closure. Still in 1615 Richard Steel noticed the passing of 14000 camel loads, full of Indian goods, through Qandahar. See Purchase, I, p.522.

LOCATION:

The towns owe their location usually to the proximity of a river.[1] A river could ensure abundance of water supply, a defensive barrier,[2] tolerable climate during summer,[3] and transport facilities.[4]

Since the city or the town comprised a large multitude of men and cattle, wells and tanks (mainly fed by rains) could hardly provide water throughout the year. It has been suggested that this was the reason why Mohenjo-dāro and Harappa were located on the banks of rivers e.g. Indus and Ravi.[5] Except a few, the principal towns referred to in the sources and belonging to the Mughals were situated on or close to river banks.[6] Besides water supply a navigable river was very helpful for transport. Transport by river, although slower, was cheaper, more commodious and less dangerous.[7]

---

1. Ibn-i-Khaldun, The Muqaddema, An Introduction to History tr. F.Rosenthal, II, pp. 244-46.

2. Manrique, II, p.191.
3. Ibid.
4. Thevenot, P.57.
5. D.D.Kosambi, pp. 54,90.

6. Among the principal cities which had no river flowing near by one was Ajmer.[redacted] It was watered from a big reservior which contained water throughout the year.

7. Thevenot, p. 57.

LAY OUT AND FORTIFICATION:

Town planning on a large scale may appear a modern idea; but it would be wrong to suppose that it was altogether an unfamiliar phenomenon in ancient or medieval times. A striking example of town planning is offered by the Indus Valley cities.[1] In Mughal India too, in the location of forts or (Imperial residences), houses of nobles, bāzārs (or mandis), merchant colonies, quarters of artisans, professional men and labourers, mosques, temples, sarāis, dharamshālā, places for burial and crematory, gardens, tank, well and slaughter house some sort of planning appears to have followed.[2]

CASTLE:

As a general practice gardens, tanks, cemetery and cremation ground and slaughter house were not located near

---

1. D.D.Kosambi, p. 54.

2. The above assertion may be corroborated from the account, given by S.M.Waliullāh in his Tārīkh-i-Farrukhābād, relating to the plan on which Farrukhābād was built in 1714 by Nawāb Ahmad Khān Bangash. The author relates, "The progeny of the rich and nobles received the border part of the town. The sarrāfs, merchants and craftsmen have been placed in the centre of the town around which a thick and strong mud well was built. Beautiful gardens have been laid out on all sides of the town. Neem trees yielding luxurious shade have been planted in the bāzārs and lanes. The town from outside looks like paradise and its handsome, tall trees are a heavenly gifts granted to the inhabitants of the town. River Ganges flows at a distance of one Karoh in the north. The town has a lofty fort around which mansions of some of the nobles have been erected." See Tārīkh-i-Farrukhābād, ff. 2a-b,3a.

the middle of the town.[1] As for the town-castle there appears to be no fixed pattern. It could be in one corner[2] of the town or it could be built on a nearby hill[3] or on elevated ground surrounded by habitation.[4] But it usually possessed effective defence works often with a river either on one side or on two sides.[5] If there was no river on any side, it was usually encircled by a deep ditch.[6]

The outer wall of the fort, built of bricks, red sand-stone or of mud, usually had two gates one front and the other rear. The door frames of the gates were strong and thick

---

1. A'īn, I, 284.

2. For the fort at Sūrat, see Ovington, pp. 129-30; Finch, Early Travels, pp. 133-34.

3. For the fort of Āsīrgarh built on high mountain, see Finch, Early Travel, p.140. The fort of Daulatābād, see, Tavernier, I, p.143. The fort of Broach on hill, see, Thevenot, p.9. Fort at Gwālīar, see, Finch, Early Travel, p.144; For Ajmer fort, see, Thevenot, p.68.

4. The fort at Burhānpūr was situated in the middle of the town, see, Tavernier, I, pp. 51-52.

5. Ovington, pp. 129-30; Gujarāt Gazetteer, p.96; Finch, Early Travels, p.140; Ibid., pp. 133-34. For the strategic situation of Allāhābād fort, see, Tavernier, I, p.116. The forts at Āgra and Delhi were flanked by the river Jamuna on two sides.

6. The present fort at Bikāner, built in the later quarter of 16th century, is situated on a levelled ground out side the town. It has a very defensive and deep trench around the outer wall. It has no river flank. However a big tank is still lying just near the front gate. The trench x is still visible. The forts of Āgra and Delhi also had trenches around the outer walls.

made of wood backed by iron strips with sharp spikes facing outwards to protect them from a charge by elephants. The wall itself was usually thick and contained battlements and string courses besides having towers on all four corners mounted with heavy cannon. The fort contained convenient space for officers, kārkhānās, kachehrī, quarters for staff, provision of water supply, store-houses, etc. Besides the fort in the capital city, meant for imperial residence, a strong fort was built in almost every town, and a garrison headed by the qilaʿdār and consisting of cavalry, infantry, matchlockmen, gunners, cannoniers and rocketeers, equipped with heavy cannon was stationed there. The garrison's tasks were to prepare against a surprise attack;[1] to keep watch over the undesirable elements of the area;[2] to store grain and treasure;[3] to supervise dāk-chaukīs and thānas[4] and to lodge

1. Out of 40000 infantry consisting of matchlockmen, gunners, cannoniers and rocketeers, 10000 were posted at the Imperial capital while the remainder 30000 were in the provinces and forts. See Pādshāhnāma, II, p.715; Finch, Early Travels, pp. 133-34, 136, 140.
2. Ibid., pp. 650-57.
3. The six big castles which the Mughals possessed (e.g. Āgra, Gwālior, Narwar, Āsir, Ranthambhor and Rohtās) kept state treasury. See Hawkins, Early Travels, p.100; Waqāi-i-Ajmer, I, p.101; Ibid. II, pp.480-81; Ibid., p. 443; Akhbārāt, document No.3298, dated 5th Ziqada; Ibid., dated 3rd Safar 33 year of Aurangzeb; Tuzuk, p.279.

4. Tuzuk, p. 317; Bāyazīd, p.269.

prisoners.[1] The forts generally were spacious enough to provide shelter to a sizable portion of the town population in times of danger.[2]

HOUSES OF NOBLES:

In the capital the principal nobles had their palaces as far as possible close to the Imperial residence.[3] But proximity to water supply appears to have been another important consideration.[4] In case of Āgra, Delhi and Lāhore for example, the nobles built their palatial enclosures containing gardens and tanks along the river.[5] It was for

---

1. Three state prisons were located in the forts of Gwāliar, Ranthambhor and Rohtās, see, Finch, Early Travels, pp. 144-45.

2. Before 1664 Sūrat had no good fort and fortifications and for that reason Shivāji caused much ruin and great loss to merchants and residents of the city. Later on it was felt that a big fort should be built so that the residents could not be plundered again. The fort was built by Ināyat Khān, the mutasaddī, Mirāt, I, p.266.

3. Pelsaert, pp. 1-2.

4. See 'Amal-i-Sālih, III, p.46. One Syed Shujat Khan, who was appointed governor of Allāhābād during the reign of Aurangzeb, got constructed many buildings and laid several garden on the banks of Ganges and Jamuna and following him all the later governors continued the practice. See MS. Fraser No.124, ff.136b-137a; Akbarnāma, II, pp. 122-123.

5. In case of Āgra Pelsaert mentions the palaces of nobles along the north-western (or the right bank) side of Jamuna in the following order. "Beginning the north, there is the palace of Bahādur Khān, who held formerly the fortress of Āsīr. Next is the palace of Rāja Bhoj,

Contd.....

this reason that Agra stretched to a length of 6 *kos* while its breadth was only ½ *kos*.[1] Similarly, at Lahore when the *Band-i-Alamgiri* was completed several nobles built their residences along the river bank.[2] In case of smaller towns the proximity to water supply and closeness to the fort from the point of security determined the setting up of houses of men of substance.[3]

(Continued from the previous page)

father of the present Rāi Ratan governor of Burhānpūr (5000 horse), then come Ibrāhim Khān (3000 horse); Rustam Kandahāri (5000 horse); Rāja Kishan Das (3000 Horse); Itiqād Khān, the younger brother of Āsaf Khān (5000 horse); Shāhzāda Khānam, sister of the present king; Gaulziaer Begam, this kings mother; Khwāja Md. Thannār; Khwāja Bansi, formerly steward of Sultan Khurram; Wazir Khān (5000 horse); Tzoaeghopoera (Shaikhpūra), a large enclosure, inhabited by the widows of the later king Akbar; the palace of Ehtibur Khān the eunuch, who was governor of Āgra city at this death, Bāqar Khān (3000 horse), Mirzā Abonssayiet (Mirzā Abu Said); the exceedingly handsome and costly palace of Asaf Khan; I'timād-ud-Daula, Khwāja Abdul Hasan, Rochia Sultan Begam (probably Ruqqaiyā Sultan Begam)." pp. 2-3 .

1. *Ibid.*, p.2; Finch, *Early Travels*, p.182.

2. For *Band-i-ʿĀlamgiri*, see *Lāhore past and Present*, p.308; Sujān Rāi, p.65; *Ibratnāma*, f. 34.

3. Tavernier, I, p.128, "Dacca is a large town, says Tavernier, which is only of extent as regards length, each person being anxious to have his house close to the Ganges. This length exceeds a coss." Ovington p.129, Describing the situation of Sūrat, Ovington mentions", the circumference of it, with the suburbs, is between two and three English miles, tending somewhat in its position to the form of a semicircle or half moon, because of the winding of the river, to which half of it adjoyns." See also *Collection of letters - Akbar to Aurangzeb*, India Office, 2678, f. 75a - in case of Mathura- the house along the bank of Jamuna.

TOWN WALL:

The towns were protected by thick walls, made of bricks or mud from eight to ten feet high. The wall had battlements and string courses and towers mounted with heavy cannon at all corners and stretegic points or on top of the city gates[1] which were shut after sun-set and guarded by posse of guards headed by a _dāroghā_ under the general supervision of the _Kotwāl_.[2] No-body could come in and go out without the written permission of the guards.[3]

---

1. For Lāhore, see Finch, _Early Travels_, p.161....."The castle or town is inclosed with a strong bricks wall, having thereto twelve faire gates, nine by land and three openings to the river." Manucci mentions "wall of burnt bricks, high and provided with bastions" Manucci, II, pp. 173-4. "Ajmer, inclosed with a stone wall, ditched round" Finch, _Early Travels_, pp. 170-71; Thevenot, p.68. For Ahmadābād, see Thevenot, p.11; Finch, _Early Travels_, p. 173. For Broach wall, see Hamilton, pp.314-15; Pelsaert, pp. 42-43: Baroda, Mundy, II, p.270; Cambay, Thevenot, pp. 17-18. Sūrat wall, see Jourdain, p.129n; Mandelslo, p.23; Tavernier, I, 7; Mundy, II, p.29; Hamilton, p.337; Careri, p.163: Agra had no wall around, however trench it had. See Pelsaert, p.I, Finch, _Early Travels_, pp.182, 185; Thevenot, p.47. Sūrat had 7 gates, see Ovington, p.130, Mundy, II, p.29; Burhānpūr formerly was an open city. In 1626 it was encircled by a mud wall which was 12 kos in circuit and there were many bastions. See Pelsaert, p.37; Multān although an ancient city became ruined. Akbar got it rebuild. Castle, wall, gates and trench were constructed. See Badāonī, II, p.251; Thevenot, p.78; Sohargaon was a walled town. See Fitch, _Early Travels_, p.28; Ujjain, although an ancient city, had no wall. Later on the city was encircled with a wall built at the cost of Rs. 126000. See _Akhbārāt_, Document No. 165; dated 2nd Rajab 1123 A.H.; _Khutūt Ahlkārān_, document No.1257 undated. The town of Daultabad had a wall of stone and was fortified with battlements and towers mounte with cannon. See Thevenot, pp.107-108. Muhammadābād a town near Ahmadābād was extended to an area of 4 _kos_, squre and the whole was surrounded by a wall. See _A'īn_, I, p.486.
2. See Chapter II, p.58 & n 4.
3. Pietro Della Valle, I, pp. 22-23; Ovington, p.130.

BĀZĀRS:

The references to several *bāzārs* existing in a single town indicate that each ward or locality had its own market where, in addition to the things of daily requirements of the residents, a particular commodity manufactured therein or brought from outside for sale was sold, the *bāzār* being often known after the name of that commodity. Sometimes the *bāzārs* were also known after the name of a particular craft and profession.[1] The big markets known as *bāzār-i-khās* (or *bāzār-i-kalān*),[2] where all sorts of commodities were on sale, were usually confined to big streets, *chaklas* (or *chauks* or *chaurāhas*),[3] in front of the fort, around principal mosques, *sarāis* and temples.[4] The smaller markets, viz. *mandis*, *ganj*, *dariba*, *jcba*, were scattered in the various wards and quarters. Along both sides of the street there used to be shops,[5] opening during the day at fixed hours and keeping open upto the first quarter of the night.[6]

---

1. See *Mirāt*, (Supp.), p.8.
2. At Ahmadābād the big market was known as bāzār-i-khās (or bāzār-i-kalān) while at Sūrat the biggest market was jewellery and fancy market. See *Mirāt*, (Supp.), p. 8, for Ahmadābād, and *Ibid.*, p.223, for Surat.
3. *Ibid.* pp. 8-9. At Ahmadābād there were 17 chaklas. Chakla, chauk or chaurāha was a spot where four roads meet, (See *Belsaria Gujarāti Dictionary*). They were main city wards, see *Bombay Gazetteer*, p.317; Mandelslo, p.22; *Haft Iqlīm*, I, p.86;
4. Tavernier, I, p.64.
5. Fryer, I, p.248.
6. Terry, *Early Travels*, p.313.

STREET:

The sources of the period give the impression that except one or two big, broad and paved streets, the other streets and lanes were narrow and short.[1]

MAHALLAS:

Outside the enclosures of the nobles, the rest of the people used to live together according to professions and crafts. The merchants, craftsmen, professionals, labourers lived in separate wards.[2] We come across names of several localities known after the crafts or professions. For example, at Agra several mahallas were known after the names of the principal crafts then plyed there or after particular castes of professional men who lived there or after a particular commodity sold. Thus, Agra had Lohā gali (a colony of Balcksmiths),[3]

1. Besides 17 chaklas which were crowded bāzārs, Ahmadābād contained 20 streets a large number of them were big while the rest were short and narrow and had no opening into the main bāzārs. See Mirāt, (Supp.), p.80. The main streets of Delhi were chāndani chauk and chauk Sādaullāh Khān, See Khāfī Khān, II, p.86.

2. When the town of Farrukhābād was planned it was intended that each trade should occupy a separate bāzār, hence we have, Kāsarhātta (braziers), Pasarhātta, druggists, sarrāfa, lohāī (ironmongers) Nunhāī (salt sellers), Khandhāi (sugar dealers). Other quarters were set aside for particular castes e.g. mochīāna (cobblers), Kolīāna (Hindu weavers), Jūlāhānpūra (muslim weavers) ..... Kāghazī mahalla (paper makers mahalla)." See the Bangash Nawābs of Farrukhābād Irvin, p.280. See for Jauharīwāra, Hīra Carpenter's street, Dyers street and tailors street at Ahmadābād, Mirāt (supp.) pp. 8-9-10.

3. Ahwāl-i-Shaher-i-Akbarābād, f. 68a.

chhāpītolā (ward of painters)[1], cheenī tolā (the sugar ward)[2], Nāī Kī mandī (barbar's ward)[3], dāl mandī[4], Ghāsmandī[5], Hing kī mandī[6], Kanārī bāzār[7], sābūn katra[8], Nīlpāra[9]. Similarly at Lāhore were telīwārā[10], mochīwārā[11], bricks-moulders ward[12], kūcha-i-āhangārān (blacksmith)[13], kūcha-i-rangrezān (dyers)[14], at Delhi mochīwārā[15], Nīl Katra[16]; and at Benāres, Katra-i-resham[17]. Even at the small town of Māliwār (sūbah Ajmer) mahallas were known after the crafts, profession and caste such as mahalla-i-zargarān (goldsmith), mahalla-i-thatherān (braziers), mahalla-i-khātriyān, mahalla-i-kunirān (vegetable sellers), etc.[18] Besides the market advantage of having a craft concentrated at one place, there was also the caste affinity that was responsible for this pattern of settlement.

The poorest men and menial servants usually had their quarters close to the city walls. However, with the further

---

1. Ahwāl, f. 54a.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., f. 55b.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., f. 39a.
9. Ibid.
10. Lāhore Past and Present, p.305.
11. Ibid., p.303.
12. Ibid.
13. Sarkar, Mughal Administration, p. 210.
14. Ibid.
15. Irvine, Later Mughals, II, p.257.
16. Naqvi, p.86.
17. Ibid.
18. See Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 181-182.

extension of the town they tended to be pushed outside the wall.[1]

PŪRA:

Each town had several suburbs (or pūras).[2] According to the Mirāt "a pūra (of Aḥmadābād) means a big street containing lofty buildings and bāzār full of precious and rare articles ..... in reality ..... (it constitutes) a big city."[3] The pūras came into being when the population of the town increased and there remained no more space within the city for further accommodation. Certain rich men got their houses built outside the wall and named the new colony (pūra) after their own name.[4] Though a pūra had all the requisites of city life; yet, without the mother town, it had no identity of its own.[5] For general as well as fiscal administration it

---

1. The Bangash Nawābs, p. 280; Aḥwāl, f.64a; Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 181-182.

2. For suburbs at Lāhore, see Mutafarriq Mahārājgan, Bundle No. I, document No.89, dated 1092 A.H. For pūras at qasba Kol, subah Āgra, see Allāhābād Document No. 527. In the document there is the mention of two puras. Allāhādād pūra and Malānwāra near Delhi darwāza. This shows that even the small towns like Kol contained pūras. See also Chandra Bhān f.44a. For a newly inhabited pūra called Lālāpūra at Mangrol established by one Lāl Beg an officer of Akbar see Corpus Inscriptions Bhāvnagri, pp. 39-40, 41, the Stone Inscription at Lālāpūra dated A.H. 1033.

3. Mirāt, (Supp.), p.111.

4. Ibid., pp. 11-12; Ā'īn says that each pūra had "all the requisites of a city", Ā'īn, I, p.486.

5. Mirāt, (Supp.), p.11.

was included in the main town. It was deemed merely a part of the extension of the main town outside the wall.[1]

Following the noble or rich man or whosoever founded the new pūra, the merchants, artisans and workmen also built their houses there and contributed to making the pūra a thriving centre of commerce and manufactures.[2]

Ahmadābād is said to have had 380 puras such as Kālupūra, Tājpūra, Jamālpūra, Hājipūra, Shāhpūra, Daryāpūra, Maqsūdpūra and Usmānpūra etc. each of which was a flourishing city in itself. Usmānpūra, for example contained two thousand shops and possessed a great trade.[3] Khāfī Khān mentions that attached to Burhānpūr there were 72 pūras and among them the

---

1. Similarly big villages also had purwa or pūra. According to Khwāja Yāsīn "a pūrwa (or pūra) is a small mauza which is called mauza-i-dākhilī in Persian. Its Jama' is entered in the mauza-i-āslī ..... since in a village the area is large and the people of the village cannot look after the far flung fields, thus for the sake of guarding it, its four corners are made populous that is called a pūrwa." See Purnea MS. f.55b. In both cases the main cause of pūras having been come into existence was the growth of population.

2. Mirāt (Supp.), pp.11-12; Tabaqāt mentions that a village Multhān in the neighbourhood of the town of Ambirsar, sūba Ajmer, was ordered to be converted into township and named Manohar Nagar. The erection of wall and fort was assigned to amīrs and a general order was issued inviting the raiyats and various classes of artisans and workers to come and settle there. See Tabaqāt, II, pp. 338-39.

3. Mirāt (Supp.), pp. 7,111; Sujān Rāi, p.56; Ā'īn, I,p.486; Tabaqāt, II, p.356; MS. Fraser, No.124, ff.123b-124a; Thevenot, p.11. For Usmānpūra, see Mirāt (Supp.), pp.11-12.

wealthy and flourishing were Bahādurpūra, Hafdapūra, Hasanpūra, Shāhganj, Shāhjahānpūra, Khurrampūra and Nawābpūra etc. each of these pūras were great trade marts where lived rich merchants and sarrāfs; and in many shops there were jewels, gold, silver worth lākhs which used to come there from the seaport of Surat. In February 1680, Sambhaji looted these pūras and carried away huge booty.[1] There is the mention of a suburb, known as Shaiṭānpūra, among many others, at Āgra where all the prostitutes of Āgra were ordered to live.[2] Similarly, at Surat a suburb named Pulpūra was exclusively peopled by fakirs.[3]

Aurangābād, a large suburb near Golkunda, was inhabited by merchants, brokers, artisans and workmen, while the population of the main city of Golkunda consisted of the King's ministers, officials and military men. Every day between 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. the merchants, brokers and others used to come to the main city to trade with foreign merchants; and when their business was over they went back to their houses. There were in the above suburb two or three beautiful mosques which served as sarāis for strangers. It also contained several temples.[4]

1. Khāfī Khān, II, pp.272-73-74; Shāhjahān Nāma, p.452.
2. Badāonī, II, p.302.
3. Ovington, p.210.
4. Tavernier, I, p.152.

HOUSES:

The general impression that one gets from the sources is that the houses in medieval Indian cities were of two type: (a) palatial enclosures built of bricks and stone belonging to the aristocracy, rich men and big merchants, (b) the houses of mud, wood and bamboo covered with straw, grass and thatch inhabited by ordinary people (the artisans, workmen and labourers). The former were spacious, airy, well-built, well supplied with water, containing gardens and tanks, and bordering the principal street.[1] The latter were small, short, dirty, with no proper arrangements of water, unsymetric and opening into narrow, short and dirty lanes.[2]

---

1. For the houses of nobles, richmen and big merchants, see Ovington, p.130. Pelsaert for the house of nobles at Āgra, pp. 66-67; Tavernier, I,p.105. For Āsaf Khān's palace at Lāhore, see Manrique, II,p.207. Finch, Early Travels, p.182; Thevenot, ~~pp.47-48. For merchants houses~~ at Sūrat, see Finch, Early Travels, p.133; Bernier,pp. 243,46,47,48. For merchants houses at Benāres, see Tavernier, I,p.118; Nobles houses at old Delhi, Ibid., p.96.

2. Speaking about common men's houses Fr. J. Xavier says, "the cities are generally built of mud, and they have not very good streets. The greater number of the houses are covered with leaves or straw." Letter tr. H.Hosten, JASB, No. XXIII (1927) p.125; Ovington, p.130. For houses in Bengāl, see Master, II,pp.92-93; Finch, Early Travels, p.185. For common men's houses at Sonārgāon, see Fitch, Early Travels, p.28. Speaking about carpenters houses at Dacca, Tavernier says, "these houses are, properly speaking, only miserable huts made of bamboo, and mud which is spread over them." Tavernier, I, p.128. The houses at

Contd......

SARĀ'IS:

The building of sarā'is was one of the benevolent works of the Imperial government,[1] the nobles[2] and also the big merchants.[3] Besides the sarā'is built on high-ways, there was hardly a town which did not have one. They were meant for travellers, strangers and for all those who came for business in the town and had to stay overnight.[4] A sarā'i could be built in the middle of the town or in one locality or in a pura. It was usually built in a the form of a square, like cloisters in a monastery and divided into several cells.[5] Sometimes [redacted] a sarā'i was so large as to cover a whole street.[6] Some of the sarā'is were built of brick and stone and looked

---

(Continued from the previous page)

Jodhpūr were of grass (Khāsh) and straw. See Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, II, p.381. For wood houses in Kashmīr, see Ā'īn, I, p.562; Pelsaert, p.34; Bernier, p.398. About houses at Dācca which were built of lanes covered with earth, see Thevenot, p.95. At Ajmer most of the houses were roofed with Khaprel, see Asnād-al-Sanādīd, ..., pp. 196-99.

1. Karori of Sirhind was asked to build a sarā'i and chabutra at Sirhind, see Pādshāhnāma, II, p.116; Ā'īn, I, p.222; Ibid., II, 39; Akbarnāma, III, p.519; Richard Steel & John Crowther, p.268.

2. Amīr-ul-umarā' Shā'ista Khān is said to have built many sarais and bridges all over Hindūstān. See Ma'āsir-i-'Ālamgīrī, p.368; See, Pelsaert, for Nūr Jahān's sarā'i, p.50; Mundy II, p.78; Manrique, II, p.100.

3. See Ovington, p.184; Manrique, II, p.100.

4. The Voyages of Nicholas Downton, p.138; Terry, Early Travels, p.311; Manucci, I, p.67.

5. Pietro Della Valle, I, p.95.

6. Ibid.

like fortified places with bastions and strong gates.[1] Others were mere enclosures of walls with 50 or 60 huts covered with thatch within.[2] The Bhatiyārins (or Mihtarānī) were the stewards in sarāis.[3] They looked after every thing there and when one wanted to depart in the morning he had to pay 1 pice or 2 pice for his stay overnight.[4] In the evening the gates were shut only to be opened again at day break."[5]

DHARAMSHĀLĀ:

Similar to sarāis were the dharamshālās, mentioned in the waqāi' Ajmer, at Ajmer built by mahājans, oswāls and mahleris. In these dharamshālās the merchants who flocked to Ajmer from all sides for business and trade used to stay. During the four months of the rains, especially, they were particularly crowded since the rains interfered with transport and those who had come in had to pass the rains there.[6]

MOSQUES AND TEMPLES:

Indian towns usually boasted of numerous mosques and temples.[7] Usually mosques were built within the locality

---

1. Mundy, II, p.89; Manucci, I, p.67.
2. Tavernier, I, p.54.
3. Manrique, II, pp. 100-101; Mundy, II, pp. 120-121.
4. Marshall, p. 117; Mundy II, p.121.
5. Ibid.
6. Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 192-93.
7. The town of Chanderi for example had 1200 mosques, see Sujān Rāi, p.63. A small town of Māliwār, sūba Ajmer, had 26 very big temples, see Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, pp.181-82. There were 500 magnificent mosques at Ahmadābād, see Mirāt, (Suppl.), p.10.

inside the town wall, whereas temples could be built within or without the town wall and were sometimes laid out in a garden close to the habitation.[1] The *'Id gāh* always was situated outside the habitation to face the west. Mosques and temples, because they were community properties, were often built by collective contributions from the respective communities. However, there are references to mosques being built by the emperor, the big nobles and rich men; and the rich *baniā* merchants erected temples at several places out of their own resources. In some towns mosques and temples were surrounded by *bāzārs*.[2] It probably so happened that when in a locality a mosque or temple was constructed certain petty shopkeers opened their shops there to supply the needs of the people who visited these places daily. Subsequently there sprang up a big *bāzār*.

SCHOOLS:

Besides being used as places of worship, the mosques and temples did serve their respective communities in another way and that was the impartation of elementary education. There are references to *madrasas*, *maktab*, *tol* and *pathshālas*, attached to mosques and temples. Here the theologians of both

---

1. For the location of temples see *Ibid.*

2. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.10, for the temple in the middle of bāzār. A big bāzār around mosque at Gwāliar, Tavernier, I, pp. 63-64. "It is the custom says Tavernier, in India, when they build a public edifice, to make around it a large place for holding markets." *Ibid.*, Tājbāzār in front Tājmahal, see *Ibid.*, pp. 109-110; *Tuzuk*, p. 210.

the communities were tutors and the main stress was laid on the study of religion, philosophy and scriptures. There are also references to madrasas and maktabs being housed in tombs and Khānqahs. The Imperial government did not usually establish these centres of education but occasionally gave stipends and gifts to its teachers.[1] Otherwise they were maintained by individual richman or by the community.

HOSPITALS FOR ANIMAL AND MEN.

In the accounts of travellers there are several references to animal hospitals established almost in all the principal towns of Gujarāt. They were run by public money donated as alms and also by certain big merchants.[2] Here old, sick and disabled animals, birds and insects were looked after.[3] At Ahmadābād we also hear of hospital meant for men. This hospital was run by the Imperial government. The Unānī Hakīms, who were physicians there, were paid from the Baitul māl (public treasury). About 2000 rupees were spent annually. We unfortunately do not have information about such hospitals in other parts of the Mughal empire.

---

1. Mir'āt, I, p. 344.

2. See Pietro Della Valle, I, p.70; Fitch, Early Travels, p.14; Thevenot, p.18; Tavernier, I, pp. 77-78.

3. Ibid.; Thevenot, p.16 ; Careri, p.165; Ovington, pp. 177-78; Pietro Della Valle, I, pp. 67-8; De Laet, p.86.

GARDENS:

Apart from the gardens within the palace enclosures, the gardens around the Mughal cities were the embodiments of magnificence.[1] According to Pelsaert, they served two purposes. During the life time of the nobles they "served for their pleasure and enjoyment ..... and after death for their tombs."[2] Nobles used to spend lavishly on gardens. A huge amount of money was spent on ensuring the supply of running water, feeding tanks and forming waterfalls,[3] on high walls made of bricks and stone with four towers on each corner with their copulaes, pillars and galleries, on arched gate sometimes 2 or 3 or 4, and on all sorts of trees, grass and flowers.[4] A tax was levied on the owner provided if the produce was more than the expense.[5] Nobles also laid out large orchards.[6]

---

1. Pelsaert, p.5; Mundy, II, P. 84.
2. Pelsaert, p.5.
3. Mirāt-al-Ālam, ff. 252b, 253a.
4. See Mundy, II, p.214 - for pattern of gardens.
5. According to an official order issued in the reign of Aurangzeb, it was settled that if the produce of the garden was more than the expenses, a fifth part from Hindus and a sixth part from Muslim was to be taken but only in proportion to increase. See Mirāt, I, pp. 263-64.
6. See, I.Habib, The Agrarian System, p. 48n.

PASTURE LAND:

There are also references to pasture land being allotted and fixed around the town.[1] Here the cows and buffalows kept by the town people used to be taken out to graze. The government charged a tax in the name of charāī.[2]

THE URBAN POPULATION:

Our sources give the impression that during our period there was a considerable concentration of population in the towns. The Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī tells us that in Akbar's empire there were 120 big cities and 3200 towns (qasbāt) each having under it from a hundred to a thousand villages.[3] This number went on increasing from time to time. For example, if we take the pargana to represent a qasba, for necessarily the pargana headquarters used to be in a qasba, then the number

---

1. In the Waqāī' Ajmer, there is the mention of pasture land around the city of Ajmer. The Waqāī reports that following a dispute the entire pasture land stretching from the city up to the limit of four or five kroh was confiscated by the Faujdār and the posted his watchmen not to let the people of the city drive their cattle for grazing and if any one dared do graze he had to pay fine or his cattle was taken away by force. The people of the city petitioned to the Sūbahdār who thereupon ordered a fresh tract of land fixed for grazing. See Waqāī-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 28, 63-64.

2. According to the Āīn, if a man kept land for pasture, a tax of 6 dams per buffalo and 3 per cow was imposed on him. However, a cultivator if he had four bullocks two cows and one buffalo per plough, was exempted from paying pasture tax. See Āīn, I, p.287. For such taxes as levy on gāu-shālas, gāu-shumārī and kāh-charāī etc. See I.Habib, The Agrarian System, p. 244n.

3. Tabaqāt, III, pp. 545-6.

of qasbāt rose to 4,350 in 1647[1] and to 4,716 in 1720.[2] A large number of these towns were pretty large. This is also borne out by the testimony of the foreign travellers who visited India during the 16th and 17th centuries and praised the towns for their size and population and favourably compared them in this respect, with towns in Europe and elsewhere. Thus it was not surprising that Delhi appeared to Bernier no less populous than Paris.[3] Both Āgra and Fatehpūr Sikri were each held to be greater than London.[4] Lāhore was placed second to none either in Asia or Europe.[5] Manrique estimated the population of Patna at 200,000.[6] Hamilton gave the same figure for Sūrat.[7] Dācca is also said to have had 200,000 inhabitants.[8] Ahmadābād according to one opinion had the population of one million.[9] The town of Chanderī (Mālwa) accommodated 384 bāzārs, 370 sarāis and 12,000 mosques.[10] Even

1. Pādshāhnāma, II, p.710.

2. Sarkar, India of Aurangzeb, p. xxvi.

3. Bernier, pp. 281-282.

4. For Āgra, see J.Xavier (tr.Hosten, JASB,N.S.,XXIII,1927, p.121); Manrique, II,p.152; Fitch, Ryley,pp.97-9, Early Travels, pp. 17-18; Salbancke, Purchas, III,p.84; Thevenot, p.49.

5. See Monserrate, pp.159-60; Coryat, Early Travels,p.243; Āīn, I,p.538; Pelsaert,p.30; Tavernier,I, pp.74,77.

6. Manrique, II, p.140; Marshall, pp. 152-53.

7. Hamilton, pp. 316-17.

8. Ibid., p.416; The India Company Paper etc., p.108.

9. Gokhale, B.G.'Ahmadābād, Pub. JESHO, Vol.XII, Part I, (Jan. 1969),p.189. But no source is cited.

10. Āīn, I, p.456; Sujān Rāi, p.53.

the small town of *Sāmāna* had 11,000 inhabitants.[1] Huglī in 1630 had the population of 14,000 out of which 1,400 were Portuguese and 10,000 others.[2]

Since towns were headquarters of administration, the emperor and his officials, the staff of the large court and official establishments must be regarded as being mainly urban. No matter, whether the court was at Āgra, Lāhore, Shāhjahānābād, Burhānpūr or Aurangābād, it always accompanied a huge population which besides the harem ladies, servants and slaves, consisted of two sets of officials : non-military staff and military personnel.

Among the non-military officials included a large number of Khazānchīs (treasurers), munshīs (clerks) attached to various departments,[3] the assayers and keepers of precious metals,[4] the employees of ābdār khāna (for water),[5] bāwarchī khāna (kitchen),[6] nānbā-khāna (bakery)[7] hawāij-khāna (for pot herbs, seasonings, sweets etc.),[8] mewā-khāna (fruitery),[9]

1. EF (1618-21) Intro, p.XXI, fn. No.1.
2. Khafī Khān, I, part III, p.470; 'Amal-i-Sālih, Vol. I, pp. 382-383.
3. Āīn, I, pp. 12-13, 14, 15, 113, 138, 155, 170.
4. Ibid., p. 18.
5. Ibid., p. 57-8.
6. Ibid., p.59.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.

rikāb-khāna (pantry),[1] āftābchī-khāna (for ewers etc.);[2] sharbat-khāna (for sharbat and beverages),[3] tambūl-khāna (betel),[4] Chirāghkhāna (lamp) mashāl khāna (torches),[5] khwushbū khāna (perfumery),[6] farrāsh khāna (for tents and carpets),[7] kurkyārag-khāna and tūshak-khāna (for dresses and stiffs of all kinds used for wearing apparel, etc.),[8] and the shawl department.[9] The number of such kārkhānas according to Abūl Fazl was more than one hundred.[10] The Imperial staff also included a large number of musicians, copyists, translators, readers painters, artists, gilders, line-drawers and binder.[11] Also enrolled amongst the civil employees of the Imperial establishment were the qūrbardārs, fast runners, gunners, and men in the elephant, camel, horse and cow-stables.[12] Then there was the staff of the mint department.[13] Furthermore, each of

---

1. Āīn., I, p. 59.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p.12.
11. Ibid., pp. 52, 106-109, 110-3, 113, 115.
12. Ibid., pp. 118, 123, 132-138, 155, 145-47, 159.
13. Ibid., pp. 14, 15, 113, 20, 21, 21-2, 245-6, 18-27 Thevenot, p. 65.

the 500 separate *harems* had numerous female attendents, *munshī dāroghas*, eunuchs and several sets of guards.[1]

Then there was the army stationed with the royal camp, According to the *Pādshāhnāma*, in the year 1647, there were 7,000 cavalry men and mounted matchlock bearers in the emperor's own establishment. They were in addition to the 185,000 horsemen maintained by the *mansabdārs* at royal capital or posted in various parts of the empire. Out of the 40,000 infantry, consisting of "matchlockmen, gunners, cannoniers and rocketeers", 10,000 used to reside with the royal camp while the remainder were posted in provinces and forts. The horsemen and infantry personnel had their families and servents which could account for a large number of men, following the soldiers alone, if Manucci is believed that, "however badly off a (cavalry) soldier is, he must have three or four servants."[3]

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.
   The legion of servants, employed to perform various duties at the royal camp at Agra, were paid the aggregate amount of Rs.77,29,669 for the year 1595. This excluded those who were enrolled on the army list. See *Āīn*, I,p.12. This shows a very large concentration of service-men around the camp. The number would appear still greater if the pay of an ordinary servant is admitted at Rs.3.3 per month (for the wages of labourers of various categories, see *Āīn*, I,p. 170). The number of ordinary servants and workingmen etc. directly or indirectly employed from this sum must, therefore, have been over 2 lakhs.
2. *Pādshāhnāma*, II,p.715. Bernier on the other hand gives a higher figure for horsemen and infantrymen which stationed with the royal camp. According to him the cavalry men numbered at 35 or 40000 while the infantry at 15000 men. Bernier, II, 219-200. Bernier's estimate for the total number of horsemen through out the empire is also slightly higher than that given by Lahori.
3. Manucci, II,p.75. "Peons or servants are exceedingly numerous in this country, for every one, be he a mounted soldier, merchant or king's official, keeps as many as his position and circumstances permit." Pelsaert, p.61.

Besides the Imperial court, the _sūbahdārs_ and other high officials too had their courts, _harem_, contingent, officials, servants and slaves at various towns to which they were posted. On a small scale, there were establishments maintained by the lower officials at _sarkār_ and _pargana_ headquarters, such as the _kotwāl_, the _muhtasib_, the _qāzi_ and the _waqā'inavis_. Then there were large establishments of nobles who were _jāgīrdārs_ (both big and small) comprising their _harem_, household staff, servants and hungers on to serve in _harem_ and stables.[1] "As a rule, says Pelsaert, 'a noble had three or four wives ..... and each had a separate apartment and numerous slaves of her own 10,20 or even 100 according to her fortune."[2] The household staff of the nobles included their _dīwāns_, _khizānadārs_, _mushrifs_, _khān-i-sāmāns_ and _wakīls_.[3] Besides this certain big nobles are mentioned to have maintained their own _kārkhānas_ where chosen artisans were kept for making robes, utensils, arms, furniture _etc_.[4] Moreover, the nobles had great reputation as builders of palaces, mosques, _sarāis_, tanks and bridges _etc_. and for building them they employed masons, technicians and labourer.[5]

---

1. Bernier, p.213.
2. Pelsaert, pp. 64-65.
3. M. 'Athar 'Alī, p.162.
4. _Ibid._, pp. 157-158.
5. _Ibid._, pp. 165-166.

And this probably led large number of casual masons and labourer to come to the towns in search of work.

In addition to the above, the other notable unproductive elements which were part and parcel of the urban life and had their share in the revenue resources of the empire were: the religious scholars and priests who led prayers in the mosques, performed rites in the temples, looked after tombs, headed monasteries (or _maths_) and were guardians of the _Khānaqahs_. Apart from the few engaged by private persons, some got support from their own community, while a large number of them were remunerated by the government through _mansab_, grant of stipends in land or cash or daily allowances.[1] To this class also may be added those who earned their livings at pilgrim centres and the _ghāts_ (bathing places) of the holy rivers and those who were fortune-tellers. They were Brahmans and no pilgrim could escape their cheat.[2] Secondly,

---

1. Badāonī was employed as the Imperial muázzin, and the court 'Imam for Wednesday prayer. He had a mansab of 20 suwār and a conditional grant of 1000 bīghas. Badāonī, II, pp. 206-7, 275-6. Gosāin Bithaldās of Gokul had land gra-nt and weighing perquisites of the grain market of the above qasba for the maintenance of the temple. See, Jhāveri, Document. IX, pp. 26-27. For land grants to Darghah-i-Ajmer Sharif, see _Farāmīn-i Salātīn_, p.6; _Asnād-al Sanādīd_, pp. 186, 188, 210, 214. For the payment to above functionaries, see also _Āīn_, I, pp. 268-70; _Tuzuk_, p.10. According to the _Āīn_, the grant of madad-i-maāsh was meant for four classes of men: learned men; religious devotees; destitute persons who were uncapable for obtaining living hood; and the persons of noble linage who would not take to any employment. _Āīn_, I, p.198; See also _Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī_, pp. 190-191.

2. Terry, _Early Travels_, p.314; Tavernier, II, p.242; Pelsaert, p.77.

those who administered or managed the *sarāis* and the *dharamshālā* built by richmen, almost in all cities, for the ease of travellers.[1] Third, the prostitutes without whom hardly there was a town. Their means of subsistance were dancing, singing; and the house of ill-fame.[2] Finally the beggars and *fakirs* who were an universal phenomenon. They themselves did nothing but forced others by persistently requesting to offer something. Their number according to Tavernier was "8,00,000 Muhammadan *fakirs* and 1,20,00,000 among the idolaters."[3] The above elements, economically unwanted as they were, had no connexion with the producing classes except sharing their hard-earned bread.

Besides the officials, troops, attendants, servants, *etc.*, the largest group among the inhabitants of towns was composed of artisans and labourers. The needs for luxuries and comforts of the aristocracy and the demand for ordinaries such as cloth, by the ordinary employees of the officials and their court establishments would have been a sufficient

---

1. See sources cited for sarāis and Dharamshālā in the section above of this chapter.

2. For prostitutes at Ahmadābād, see *Mirāt*, I, p.263; *EF* (1620-22), p.251; For them at Thaṭṭa, see, Manrique, II, p.240; Public women at Golkunda, see Tavernier, I, pp.157-158; Manrique, II, pp.161, 242;

3. Beggars at Cambay, see Pietro Della Valle, I, p.69; Tavernier, I, p.392; Finch, *Early Travels*, p.19.

reason to attract them to cities.[1] But long-distant trade, too helped to develop urban commodity production. The import of horses,[2] rarities, gold and silver,[3] which created a counter demand for native goods ultimately stimulated production for exports (i.e. cotton cloths, silk goods, saltpetre, indigo etc.). The growing trade (17th c.) in calicoes and other fabrics not only provided necessary impetus for popularising the weaving industry but also gave birth to a number of ancillary trades. Mention in this regard may be made of cloth carding, spinning, thread processing, bleaching, dyeing,

---

1. Although parts of the requirements of the aristocracy were met out by the goods produced in state <u>Kārkhānas</u>, nevertheless, there are references of large scale purchase of finished goods for the ruling classes from best and finest production centres. For example, the entire while cloth produced at Dhār (Mālwa) was purchased by noblemen. See <u>Khāfī Khān</u>, II, pp. 234-35. Muslin was purchased from <u>Sironj</u>, see Tavernier, I, pp. 56-57. Embroidered cloth from Ahmadābād, see <u>Mirāt</u>, I, p. 233. The construction of large number of palaces, forts, tanks, tombs, mosques sarāis and gardens during our period was sure to provide employment to a large number of masons, varied craftsmen and labourers. See Bernier, pp. 246-48; M. Athar Ali, pp. 165-6.

2. For import of horses, see <u>Aīn</u>, I, p. 140; Irvine, The Army, pp. 51-52. For other foreign imports to India. See <u>Letters Received</u>, II, pp. 300-301. <u>Ibid</u>, III, p. 8; <u>Ibid</u>. IV, p. 251. <u>EF</u> (1618-21), p. 18; Master, I, p. 133. For the import of copper, see Moreland <u>Akbar to Aurangzeb</u>, pp. 183-5.

3. For the Influx of gold and silver, see. Bernier, pp. 202, 204. Thevenot, p. 241. '<u>The Suma Oriental of Tome Pires</u>", ed. by Armando Cortesao, Vol. I, pp. 12-13, 21, 43, 44, 100- for silver import from Aden, Ormuz and Pegu; K.N. Chaudhuri, p. 120; K. Glamann, '<u>Dutch Asiatic Trade</u>, p. 59; Miss Aziza Hasan, <u>Silver Currency</u>, Pub. <u>ICSHR</u>, Vol. 6, No. I, (1969) pp. 85-116; Om Prakash & J. Krishnamurty, <u>Mughal Silver Currency - A Critique</u>, <u>ICSHR</u>, Vol. 7, No. I (1970) pp. 141-142, 143. For the value of annual imports of treasure and other goods from England see the paper by present writer, '<u>The ~~custom and~~ custom house at the port of Sūrat</u>, pub. <u>Studies in Islam</u>, Jan. Oct. 1971, App. IV, pp. 162-164.

embroidering, and manufacturing clothes interwoven with gold and silver threads.[1] It drew a growing number of people, besides the _jūlāha_ and _Kolī_, of other castes as well to take to above crafts. In Bengāl, for example, at the town of Dinājpūr, with the development of weaving industry and in view of the large profit, even the women of Brahman and peasant castes employed themselves in spinning.[2] A similar practice was current at Bhāgalpūr.[3]

The various categories of handicrafts producers residing in towns were: firstly, weavers (_jūlāha_) of cotton, silk and woollen clothe and those who played allied industries such as carder (_dhunniyā_), spinner (_kātérā_), processor of thread (_kolī_), painter (_chītārī_), embroiderer (_patuhā_), dyer (_rangbāl_) bleacher, workers in gold and silver thread and weaver of rough fabrics; secondly, those engaged in the manufacture of articles from metals - gold and silver (_sunār_) iron (_luhār_) brazier (_thathérā_) fire-worker (_atishbāz_); thirdly, stone-cutter, brick-maker, mason (_rāj_), lime-maker (_chunāgar_),

---

1. Stimulated by the demands for textiles from European markets at Ahmadābād along with weaving sprang up a number of ancillary industries. For information see, The English Factors reports from the above city _EF_ (1642-45), p.137; _Ibid._, (1646-50), pp. 59,99.

2. R. Montgomery Martin, II, p. 969.

3. _Ibid._, p. 267.

worker in ivory, coral amber, saltpetre, lac-maker (lakhera) and the producers from mine, forest, tank, river and sea, fishermen (dhibar), fourth, the wood-workers and assemblers of cart, boat and ship (badhai); fifth weighman (tolā), barber (nāī), tailor (darjī), fixers of horse-shoe (nālbandh), washermen (dhobī), confectioner (halwāī or kandoea) etc. sixth, the manufacturers of indigo, sugar, tobacco, intoxicants and oilman (telī) and finally the producers of vegetables (kāchhī) and gardeners (mālī). The above were skilled workers. Out of them quite a large number were employed by the state or engaged by nobles and rich men while majority of them were self-employed, plying their own business, and received cash payments for their producer or work.[1]

Naturally, compared to other sections of the urban population the number of labourers was very large.[2] However, they were perhaps divisible into semi-skilled and unskilled.

---

1. The above list has been completed from the Āīn, I, pp. 294-301; Mirāt, I, pp. 286-287; and Ardha Kathānak, pp. 4-6. For barber, see Mundy, II, pp. 86-87; Tavernier, II, pp. 185-86. For tailor at Sūrat, see Ovington, p. 166. For ātishbāz see Khutūt Ahlkārān, document No. 1292, undated. For carpenter, weaver, workers in Ivory see, Hamilton, p. 320.

2. Akbarnāma, II, p. 356; Pelsaert, p. 61; Ardhā Kathānak op. cit.

The first category included those employed in various productive activities such as building industry, ship-building, diamond mining, saltpetre extraction and salt making etc.[1] There they worked with skilled artisans such as masons and carpenters. This category also comprised such workers as _sagga_, _kahār_, thatcher, grain porchers,[2] while the unskilled labourers were porters, guards, messengers _pāikārs_ and all others who did menial services.[3]

The mercantile community appears to have been a heterogeneous class, comprising various racial elements.[4] In the literature of the period the members of the above community had been variously called _baniāns_, _banik_, _banika-baqqāl_, _saudāgar_, _vyāpāri_, _tājir o tujjār_ (or _tijārati_) _seth_ (or satiya

---

1. _Khutūt Mahārājgan_, document No.668, dated 38th year of Aurangzeb. The above document is a letter written by Mir Muhammad to Mahārāja Bishan Singh requesting the latter to direct the thānadār and faujdārs to supply labourers to work with masons at the fort of Sansni. About 60000 labourers were employed at dimond fields in Deccan.' Tavernier, quoted by Moreland, _India at the Death of Akbar_ p. 142; For labourers employed to work in saltpetre industry, see Pelsaert, p.46;

2. See _Ardha Kathānak_, pp. 4-5.

3. For porters at the port of Sūrat, see _Akhbārāt_, document No.2036 dated 19th Shawwāl, 26th year of Aurangzeb. About 9000 porter were in employment at the above port. For Palledars at Mathura, see _Khutūt Maharajgan_, bundle No.4, document No.758, dated 39th year of Aurangzeb, For business messengers, see _Vakil Report_, Bundle No.I, document No.I, dated 20th Zilhijja 1100 A.H.; _Ibid._, document No. 1223, dated 18th Zilhijja, 1117 A.H.; _Ibid._, document No. 1238, 3rd Safar, 1118 A.H.; _Ibid._, document No.1252, dated 14th Rabi II, 1118, A.H. For pāikār, see Master, I,p.42, _Ibid._, II, pp. 10-13,14,274.

4. Barbosa, I,pp.139-141; Albuquerque, _The Commentaries_, III, pp.68-70.

mahājan, sāhukār, vohra, sarrāf, muqīm, dallāl and arhatiya.[1]

Among the above, with the exception of the sarrāf and the dallāl no strict classification based on work and made of business appears to have existed. Even in case of the sarrāf and the dallāl the two professions got interturned, as sarrāf often acting as dallāl, otherwise, the merchants were just classified as either big (bara saudāgar) or small (kachha saudāgar). At times, with money in hand a kachha saudāgar could become a bara.[2]

The merchant community was probably quite numerous. If the Mirāt is believed, there were 84 castes or sub-castes of Hindu merchants, besides their counterparts among Muslims at Ahmadābād.[3] One can very well understand the concentration of merchants and their business at Patna when the number of brokers alone was 600.[4]

---

1. For Baniān, Banik, Baniā-Baqqal, see Mirāt (Suppl.) p.138; For Saudāgar, see Manrique II, p.248; Careri, p.256; Vayapāri, see Mirāt, I, p.263; Waqāi-iAjmer, I, 345-346; Tājir o Tujjār (or Tijārati), see Mirāt (Suppl.) p.14. For Seth, see EF, (1634-36) pp. 196-197. Mahājan, see Waqāi-i-Ajmer, II, pp. 562, 579, 696, 616, 498, 702 and 703 etc. For Bohra or Vohra, see Mirāt (Suppl.) pp. 131-132. For Sarrāf, see Mirāt, I, pp. 410-411. J. Van Twist, p.73. Tavernier I, p.28. For Muqīm, Mirāt (Suppl.) p.180, Dallāl see Mirāt (Suppl.) p.180; Kāghazāt Mutafarriq, pp. 4b-5a; and for Arhatiya, see EF (1618-21), p.85.

2. EF (1624-29), pp. 149-150.

3. Mirāt, (Suppl.) pp. 138-139.

4. Manrique, II, p.140.

CHAPTER II

KOTWĀL-HIS DUTIES, AND THE CHABUTRA-I-KOTWĀLĪ

The *Kotwāl* occupied a pivotal position in Mughal town-administration. The information available in the records and the observations of the European visitors lead us to believe that the functions of the *Kotwāl* were very comprehensive, sometimes appearing to be wider in scope than those of modern municipal institutions.[1] He combined in him the executive, police and judicial powers within the limits of the town.

APPOINTMENT AND MANSAB:

The *Kotwāl* was usually appointed by the Imperial government at the recommendation of *Mīr-i-Ātish* through a *sanad* bearing his seal.[2] It appears that during the reign of Bahādur Shāh he was appointed by the Emperor himself, but sometimes also by the *Nāzim*.[3] In the records of the 17th century there are references to *Kotwāls* appointed by the *jāgīrdārs* in the towns

---

1. For the functions of *Kotwāl*, see *Āīn*, I, pp.292, 293-294; *Mirāt*, I, pp. 168-9; *Hidāyat-al-Qawānin*, ff. 30b-31a; Manucci, I, p.292. Manucci defines the *Kotwāl* as 'chief magistrate ruling over the whole city'; Thevenot, p.27; Manucci, II, pp. 295-6; Tavernier, I, p.447; Fryer, I, p. 246; Ovington, pp. 137-38; Pelsaert, p.57; Bernier, p. 369; *EF*, (1622-23), pp. 124-25; Hamilton, p.321; Manrique, II, pp.188-9; *Dastūr-i-Jahān Kushāi*, f. 55a; *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī*, ff.238ab, 239a; Badāonī, II, p.390; *Dastūr-Jawāhar Nāth Bekās*, ff.26b,27ab; *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī*, ff. 43b,144a.

2. *Mirāt*, (Suppl.) p.178.

3. *Ibid*.

placed within their jāgīrs. But perhaps this right was admissible only in case of the big assignees, who might have been expressly granted Kotwālī jurisdictions.[1]

The Kotwāl of Ahmadābād, besides possessing 100 infantry provided by the Nāzim-i-Sūba, had 50 suwār conditional (mashrūt) and drew salary of Rs. 213 a month.[2] The Kotwāl of the larger towns, being a man of varied responsibilities, used to be counted among the high officials of the Mughal government.[3] His mansab varied in accordance with the magnitude of work, the size of population and the administrative status of the city or town. This may be seen from the following table:

Name	Mansab	Town	Year
Nūruddīn Qulī	1000/300	Āgra	Ist year of Jahāngīr[4]
Ihtimām Khān	1000/300	Āgra	3rd year of Jahāngīr[5]
Nūruddīn Qulī	1000/300	Āgra	12th year of Jahāngīr[6]

1. Mazhar-i-Shāhjāhānī, p.53, Khutūt Mahārājgan, document No. 15, dated 5th year of Aurangzeb, Ibid., document No.2743, undated, Ibid., document No.1828, dated 1127 A.H.
2. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.178.
3. See Jagat Rāi, f.20b, Tuzuk, p.64.
4. Ma'āsir-al-Umarā, Vol.III, pp. 817-818.
5. Tuzuk, p.68.
6. Ma'āsir-al-Umarā, III, pp. 817-818.

Table (continued)

Name	Mansab	Town	Year
Sayyid Bahuwa	1,000/600	Delhi	14th year of Jahāngīr[1]
Ṣādiq Khān	400/400	Lāhore	10th year of Jahāngīr[2]
Sarandās Khān	1,000/600	Delhi	6th year of Shāhjahān[3]
ʻĀqil Khān	100/100	Multān	10th year of ʻĀlamgīr[4]
Ihtimām Khān	600/200	Āgra	25th year of ʻĀlamgīr[5]
Tāj Khān	50/20	Kābul	25th year of ʻĀlamgīr[6]
Bāqī Khān	600/450 (out of that 400 do aspa se aspa both Kotwāl Faujdār)	Delhi	40th year of ʻĀlamgīr[7]

1. *Tuzuk*, p.282.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 381.

3. *Pādshāhnāma*, I, p.450.

4. *Akhbārāt*, dated 13th Rabī II, 10th Year Aurangzeb.

5. *Ibid.*, document No. 1582, dated 29th Zilhijja, 25th year Aurangzeb.

6. *Akhbārāt*, document No. 1788, dated, 11th Jumāda, 25th year Aurangzeb.

7. *Ibid.*, document No. 3245, dated 14th Ramzan, 40th year Aurangzeb.

Though the appointment of Kotwāl was at the discretion and pleasure of the Imperial government which could post any person whom it favoured, the opinion of the inhabitants of the town concerned could also have had a role in influencing its decision. Documents belonging to the 17th century (now in the Bikāner Archives) throw a good deal of light on the matter. It was reported in the waqā'i' Kābul, received at the Imperial headquarters in the 25th year of Aurangzeb, that "the Nāzim-i Sūba of Kābul wishes to appoint one Tāj Chaman Afghān, Kotwāl of Kābul city, but the inhabitants of the city, who are either Īrānī or Tūrānī, do not want an Afghān kotwāl. Therefore, some one else from amongst Īrānīs or Tūrānīs may be appointed and not an Afghān."[1] Again in the 29th year Aurangzeb, a similar report came from Kābul and the Nāzim was thereupon required to explain why he was insisting on appointing an Afghān as Kotwāl of Kābul while there were several Īrānīs or Tūrānīs deserving that office.[2]

In the 10th regnal year of Aurangzeb, as reported in the waqā'i' from Multān, 'Āqil Khān petitioned that Shaikh Hasin, dārogha-i-mandi of Multān (mansab 100/100) should be appointed Kotwāl of Multān because the entire population of

---

1. Akhbārāt, document No.1788, dated 11th Jumāda I, 25th year of Aurangzeb.

2. Ibid., document No. 2962, dated 21st Zīlqada, 29th year of Aurangzeb.

the city was happy with him and not with the newly appointed Bashāham Beg. The Emperor thereupon ordered that the appointment of Bashāham Beg be set aside and that Shaikh Hasīn be appointed in his place.[1] In one of the Vakīl's Reports (Arzdāsht of Kanwal Nain to Mahārāja Rām Singh), dated 11th Shawwāl 1093 A.H., it is reported that the Afghāns of the frontier petitioned to 'Umdat-ul-Mulk to dismiss the then Kotwāl of Peshāwar. Their request was accepted and Mīr Turk, a man of their choice was appointed. The report further mentions that the former Kotwāl was very oppressive, and that was why the people sought his removal.[2] In another document known as Khutūt-i-Mahārājgān, dated 5th year of Aurangzeb, one Alī Taqī requested to Mirzā Rāja Jai Singh to reappoint the dismissed Kotwāl, named Harga, of Jai Singhpūra at Lāhore, for the people wanted him.[3] A similar request came from Ujjain. The people of hawīlī Ujjain were dissatisfied with Manorath Rām Kotwāl and petitioned that some other man be appointed in his place. Their request too was accepted.[4]

---

1. Akhbārāt, dated, 13th Rabī II, 10th year Aurangzeb.
2. Vakīl Report, Bundle No. I, document No.41, dated 11th Shawwāl, 1093 A.H.
3. Khutūt-i-Mahārājgān, document No.5, dated 5th year of Aurangzeb.
4. Ibid., document No. 2743 undated.

On the basis of such evidence, it may be safely inferred that in the appointment of Kotwāl the wishes of the city people or public pressure was quite a relevant factor. The Imperial government might avoid imposing unwanted man.

The grounds on which dismissal, transfer, reduction in mansab and post of the Kotwāl might occur were failure to discharge his duties properly;[1] complaint by the residents of the town against tyranny;[2] abuse of authority;[3] taking bribes and extracting money through unauthorized levies;[4] and finally disobedience or negligence shown to government orders.[5]

DUTIES:

If the Āin-i-Kotwāl[6] and Akbar's farmān given in Mirāt-i-Ahmadī,[7] containing instruction for Kotwāl, are read together

---

1. Akhbārāt, document No.1582, dated 29th Zilhijja 25th year Aurangzeb; Ibid., dated Ist Safar 10th year Aurangzeb; Akbarnāma, II, p.17, Pahlwān Gulgaz, the Kotwāl of Lāhore, ended his life for fear and shame. For, Abūl Maālī escaped from lock up at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.
2. Vakīl Report, Bundle No. I, document No.41, dated 11th Shāwwāl, 1093 A.H; Akhbārāt, dated 13th Rabi II, 10th year of Aurangzeb; Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan, document No.2743 undated.
3. Ma'āsir-i-Ālamgīrī, p.188; Akhbārāt, dated 21st Zilqada, 1115 A.H. 'Abdul Salām Kotwāl of Delhi quarrelled with 'Abdul Qāsim diwan, thereupon the former was transferred. Rāja Bishan Singh was asked to appoint another Kotwāl at Mathura in place of Bāzi who used to interfere in matters concerning Sharīat. See Akhbārāt, dated 6th Jumāda II, 1109 A.H.
4. Akhbārāt, p.12 (the Akhbārāt for this year is in book form) dated 12th Zilqada, 39th year Aurangzeb.
5. Jahāngīr got a Kotwāl flogged in his own presence because he failed to prohibit the slaughter of animals and the sale

Contd......

then one gets the picture of an ideal city government headed by a very powerful autocrat. The Āʾīn declares rather rhetorically that "the appropriate person for this office should be vigrous, experienced, active, deliberate, patient, astute and humane."[1] However, whatever his abilities in reality the Kotwāl was certainly a powerful and could make life in a city pleasant or intolerable at his will.[2]

POLICE DUTY:

The Kotwāl may, in one important aspect of his office, be called the head of Police. His main responsibility was the watch and ward of the town and its suburbs. Akbar's farmān enjoins that "the Kotwāl of every city and town and village ought to record its houses and buildings and prepare a note of the residents of every street from house to house as to know what sort of men they are; How many are cultivators, how many professional, how many soldiers and derwishes. Streets

---

(Continued from the previous page)

of meat. See Payne, p.38; see also Waqāʾi-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 211-212.

6. Āʾīn, I, pp. 284-285.

7. Mirāt, I, pp. 168-170.

1. Āʾīn, I, p. 284.

2. Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn, ff. 30b-31a; Mirāt, I, p.168; Thevenot, p.27; Ovington, p.137.

should be fixed and a mīr-i-mahalla (head of a ward) should be appointed so that the good and bad of that street may happen under his direction. A spy should visit him (mīr-i-mahalla) every night and day to write the events of that street. It should be so settled that whenever a thief comes or there is fire or some unpleasant event takes place, the neighbour should immediately rush to his (the victim's) help. In like manner, the mīr-i-mahalla and the informer should help him.[1]"

The farmān further instructs that whenever an owner of a house leaves the town he should inform his neighbour, the mīr-i-mahalla and the spy about his departure and whereabouts. On the arrival of a guest, either a relative or a stranger, the host should inform about him to either of the above mentioned. The informer was to write daily reports of all events and the arrival and departure of any person in the street. It was to be shown to the Kotwāl. If no body was prepared to stand surety for a stranger, he was to be made to stay at a separate and secure place fixed by the mīr-i-mahalla and the informer, under the direction of the Kotwāl.[2]

---

1. Mirāt, I, pp. 168-170.
2. Ibid.; Badāonī, II, p.390; MS. Fraser No.124, ff.26b-27ab.

The *Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn* furnishes a set of interesting instructions as to the action to be taken immediately by a newly appointed *Kotwal*: "On taking over charge, he should satisfy himself by personal inspection that the horse and foot allotted to his post are really up to the fixed strength and have their proper equipment, arms and stores, and that the appurtenances of his office such as long rods, fetters and lashes - are really up to the number entered in the official list." He should check the number of the prisoners and ascertain the charges against them. Then he should report to the authority concerned (*Ṣāḥib-mu'āmala*, probably the *Qāzī*) the cases of those prisoners whom he thinks innocent and secure their release. In the case of the guilty persons who can pay, he should take orders for exacting suitable fines from them and then set them free. In the case of penniless prisoners, the *Kotwāl* should report and take action as commanded. A statement of the cases of those deserving to be kept in prison should be sent to the authority for enforcing the *Sharīat* (*Ṣāḥib-mu'āmala bār-vābī sharīāt*, and the orders passed by the latter over their signatures should be carried out by the *Kotwāl*. In case of those deserving death, the *Kotwāl* should, through proper officers, freely state their cases to the authority enforcing the *Sharīat* in writing, on the day of trial, receive the *qāzīs* signed sentence of death, and execute the sentence."[1]

---

1. *Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn*, ff. 29a-b, 30a.

The prevention of theft, crime and murder within the limits of the town was another important responsibility of the *Kotwāl*. The *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī* contains a *sanad* of appointment issued to Muḥammad Beg, *Kotwāl* of *qasba* Muḥammadābād *urf* Benāres and master of ferry over Ganges. He is directed to see that "there be no theft in the town, and the inhabitants while enjoying security may carry on their respective trades peacefully."[1]

The *Kotwāl* was to establish night watch (*chaukī*) in every *maḥalla*.[2] He himself was to ride out patrolling the streets thrice a night at 9 p.m., 12 p.m. and 3 a.m. .... at which hours drums used to be beaten and a large copper trumpet sounded, the men of his patrolling party loudly pronouncing the word *khabardār*.[3] The other patrolling parties in the neighbouring street was to repeat the same word *khabardār*.[4]

Whenever he got information of a theft or dacoity, he had to run along with his force to the spot and there are

---

1. *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī*, ff. 238ab-239a.

2. *Dastūr-i-Jahān Kushāi*, f. 66a; *Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn*, ff. 30b-31a; *Waqā'i-i-Ajmer*, II, p.497; *Ibid.*, I, p.286; *Akhbārāt*, document No.1626, dated 23rd Shawwāl, 25th year of Aurangzeb; *Ms. Fraser* No.124, ff. 469b-470a; Thevenot, pp. 27-28; Bernier, p. 369.

3. Ovington, p.137; Thevenot, pp. 27-28.

4. *Ibid.*

reports of severe encounters with the dacoits.[1] The Kotwāl under all circumstances was required to catch the guilty and recover stolen property. If he failed he had to compensate for all thefts, crimes and murders committed within his jurisdiction.[2] He was instructed particularly to discover the real culprit and so treat him as to prevent recurrence of the crime. In order to check theft and crime he had orders not to allow people to enter or leave the town after nightfall, without his dastak (pass).[3] After sunset all the gates of the town wall were shut and heavily guarded.[4]

MUNICIPAL FUNCTIONS:

During the medieval period, there naturally existed no municipal organisations of the kind we have today. However,

---

1. Akhbārāt, document No. 1146, dated 22 11th Safar, 24th year of Aurangzeb; MS. Fraser No.124, ff. 469b-470a.

2. Khutūt Mahārājgan, document No.2181, dated 24th Sha'bān 1130 A.H; Shāhjahānāma, p.327; Akhbārāt, document No. 3300, dated 18th Zīlqa'da 38th year Aurangzeb; Tavernier I, p.47; Thevenot, p.28; Akhbārāt, dated 4th Zīlqa'da, 1112 A.H; Ibid, dated 10th Safar, 1113 A.H; Ibid, dated 20th Safar, 1114 A.H.

3. Khāfī Khān, II, pp. 172-73; Hamilton, p.321; Tavernier, I, p.47; The Eng.Factories, (1622-23) p.258; Akhbārāt, document No. 2304, dated 2nd Muharram, 27th year of Aurangzeb.

4. Vakīl Report, Bundle No.I, document No. 321.

there are references to functions discharged by the *Kotwāl* that fall within the scope of work of modern municipal bodies. The main functions of the *Kotwāl* in this respect were to provide separate quarters (localities) for different sections of the town population such as merchants, craftsmen, artisans, prostitutes, butchers and menial servants;[1] to regulate and provide places for the cremations, burials and slaughter-houses outside the town wall;[2] to establish separate *sarais* for new-comers;[3] to observe minutely the income and expenditure of various classes of men and set the idle to work;[4] to reserve separate ferries and wells for men and women, and regulate the supply of water courses for general public;[5] and to allocate the different types of markets at different places.[6]

CONTROL OVER MARKET:

An important function of the *Kotwāl* was the control and supervision of markets. First, he was to endeavour to ensure

---

1. *Āin*, I, pp. 284-85.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 284. It was also the Kotwāl's duty to arrange for carrying and finally disposing of the dead bodies in case if pestilence struck the town. Marshall, for example, saw at Patna the dead-bodies removed and cast into the Ganges by the Kotwāl when every day 100 persons were dying. See Marshall, p.127.
3. *Āin*, I, p.284.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*

low prices, prevent men from going out of the city to buy supplies (with a view to cornering the stocks) and to see that the rich did not purchase beyond what was necessary for their consumption so as to eliminate the danger of hoarding.[1] Secondly, he was further directed to suppress engrossing.[2] Thirdly, he was to prohibit the realisation of certain forbidden cesses.[3] Next, he was required to so direct the people that the old coins should be deposited with the mint or paid into the treasury at the rate of bullion.[4] He had to ensure that the official rates (of discount) upon the royal gold and silver coins were observed, and that coins that had lost in weight were to be under no greater discount than the amount of actual loss in weight.[5] Enforcing the standard weights and measures and preventing fraud therein was his responsibility.[6] In the markets, he kept watchmen to seize pickpockets and thieves and bring them to him for punishment.[7] Finally, he was enjoined to appoint heads and brokers in the

1. Āīn, I, p.284; Mirāt, I, pp.169-70; Dastūr-i-Jahān Kushāī f. 55a.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Āīn, I, p.284; Mirāt, I, pp. 169-70.
5. Ibid.; Badāonī, II, p.390.
6. Āīn, I, p.284.
7. Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn, f. 30ab; Guldasta-i-Sultanat, f. 34a.

markets for various commodities and these were expected to be informed of all transactions, and take from them a daily diary (roznāmcha) thereof.[1] During the reign of Aurangzeb some of the duties of the Kotwāl with regard to market control, were transferred to muhtasib, e.g. the enforcement of the standard weights and measures; checking of the counterfeit coins or coins deficient in weight; testing articles of food and prevention of the sale of adulterated vendibles; and removal of obstruction from streets like dirt and sweeping, and ensuring that no body in the market had a portion of the bāzār for opening his shops in the area meant for public traffic.[2]

PROTECTION OF UNCLAIMED PROPERTY:

If any body died heirless in the town or its suburbs, no matter whether resident of the same town or a stranger, the Kotwāl, on being informed, was to take possession of the entire property and after strict search and counting, it was to be sealed (with the seals of Kotwāl and qāzī) and then kept at the chabutra-i-Kotwālī.[3] If, after sometime, the heir happened to appear and his genuineness was proved to the satisfaction of the Kotwāl, and certified by the qāzī, the property was to be

1. Mirāt, I, p.169.

2. For the reference, see Muhtasib, Chapter III, pp. 111-112.

3. EF (1622-1623), pp. 124-25.

handed over to him after some deduction; otherwise, it was deposited in *baitulmāl*.[1] The same procedure was followed in disposing of the unclaimed property found lying on the road.[2]

ERADICATION OF SOCIAL ABUSES:

The *Āʾīn* instructs the *Kotwāl* "not to allow a woman to be burnt against her wishes, nor a man to commit suicide, nor any one to be circumcised below the age of twelve."[3] The *Āʾīn* further enjoins that, "he should direct that no ox or buffalo, or horse or camel be slaughtered, and forbid the restriction of personal liberty and sale of slaves.[4] He should prohibit women from riding on horseback.[5] Religious enthusiasts, wandering fakirs, and dishonest tradesmen etc. should be expelled or deterred from their conduct, but he should be careful in this matter not to molest a god-fearing recluse, or persecute barefooted anchorites.[6] He should prohibit his adherents from wearing sombre garments in mourning and induce them to wear red."[7]

1. *Mirʾāt*, I, p.169.
2. *Ibid*.
3. *Āʾīn*, I, p.284.
4. *Ibid*.; See also Payne, p.38, Jahāngīr is reported to have flogged a Kotwāl for his failure to prohibit the slaughter of animals and the sale of meat.
5. *Āʾīn*, I, p.284; *Mirʾāt*, I, p.170.
6. *Āʾīn*, I, pp. 284-285.
7. *Ibid*., p. 285.

The *Kotwāl* was also to check the kidnapping of girls[1] and forced marriage.[2] Prostitutes and dancing - girls were always at his mercy.[3] Nobody could openly drink and sell intoxicants.[4] He was also to see that religious sentiments of any community were not aroused by provocation or abuse, and communal harmony was maintained.[5]

HOW TO MAKE A MAN CONFESS HIS CRIME:

The method usually adopted by the *Kotwāl* to make a suspected-man confess his crime was the severely whipping and torturing in many ways. "When any one is robbed", says Thevenot, "this officer apprehends all the people of the house both young and old where the robbery hath been committed, and causes them to be beaten severely. They are stretched out upon the belly, and four men hold him that is to be punished by the legs and arms, and two others have each along whip of twisted thongs of leather made thick and round, wherewith they lash the patient one after another, like smiths

1. *Waqā'i-i-Ajmer*, I, p.266.

2. *Ibid.*; Badāonī, II, p.391.

3. *Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn*, p. 30b; Manucci, II, pp.395-6; *Akhbārāt*, Document No. 1699, dated 9th Muharram 9th year of Aurangzeb.

4. *Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn*, f.30b; Manucci, II, pp. 395-6; *EF (1622-1623)*, Introduction, p. xix; *Mirāt*, I, p.169. *Waqā'i-i-Ajmer*, I, p.183.

5. See MS. Fraser 124, ff. 170b-171a.

striking on an anvil, till he have received two or three hundred lashes, and be in a gore of blood. If at first he confess not the theft, they whip him again next day, and so for several days more, until he hath confessed all, or the things stolen be recovered again; and what is strange, the cotoval neither searches his house or goods, but after five or six days, if he do not confess he is dismissed."[1]

DEFENCE OF THE TOWN AND FORT:

Numerous instances on records show that in the hours of danger and emergency the Kotwāl appeared as defender of the town and its fort.[2] In most of the cases it so happened only when the Faujdār and the qil'adār were absent from the town.[3] For instance, when Sultān Khusrau rebelled and fled towards Lāhore and the city was without faujdār and qil'adār, the Kotwāl, Nūruddīn Qulī, along with the dīwān, arranged his force, came out of the city, defended the fort and successfully prevented the entry of the prince into the city.[4] If per chance, there happened to be no faujdār and qil'adār, their

1. Thevenot, p. 28.

2. Akhbārāt, document No. 1525, dated 23rd Shawwāl, 26th year Aurangzeb.

3. Tuzuk, p.29; Iqbālnāma-i-Jahāngīrī, p.11.

4. Tuzuk, p.29; 'Anfa'al-akhbār, B.M. Or. 1761, f.218b; Ma'āsir-i-Jahāngīrī, f. 32b.

duties were performed by the Kotwāl.[1] In certain cases the posts of faujdār and qil'adār were combined with that of Kotwāl.[2] In Mughal hierarchical order, the Kotwāl was junior to both the faujdār and qil'adār, and his responsibilities were far distinct. Nevertheless, in Mughal administrative set up it was so desired that all the three would work in close co-operation and with mutual help whenever there was danger to the peace and security of the city and qila' therein.[3] Otherwise, in normal course the authority of the Kotwāl could hardly be

---

1. Akbarnāma, III, p.422; EF. (1661-64), p.311.

2. Tuzuk, pp. 267,282. One Bāqī Khān was both Kotwāl and Faujdār of Shāhjahānābād, see Akhbārāt, document No.3245, dated 14th Ramzan, 40th year Aurangzeb. In another case, one Murtazī Qulī, Kotwāl Etāwa, petitioned that "the Faujdārī and dīwānī together with Kotwālship of Chakla Etāwa be assigned to me." See Akhbārāt, document No. 3298, dated 5th Zilqa'da 38th year Aurangzeb.

3. It was also the responsibility of the Faujdār to defend the towns (lying in his area) whenever attacked by thieves, rebels and trouble-creators. From Sikandrābād, for instance, the report came that the trouble-creators had attacked the town of Sikandrābād (sūba Shāhjahānābād) during midnight. The Faujdār, Abūl Fazl, apprehending that the Kotwāl was unable to defend the town, himself came out to oppose the besiegers. A bitter fight took place in which the Faujdār got wounded but he successfully repelled the attackers and defended the town. See Akhbārāt, document No.3016, dated 15th Rabī, II, 31st year Aurangzeb; see also Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan, document No.3027, undated, Akhbārāt, document No. 2893, dated 28th Shawwāl 29th year Aurangzeb. In certain cases, the Faujdār and qil'adār were punished for their carelessness and being inactive to defend the town against night attack, see Akhbārāt, document No. 2462, dated 4th Muharram 28th year; Akhbārāt, document No. 3737, dated 25th Zilqa'da 51th year Aurangzeb. In another case, the Faujdār and Kotwāl of Āgra were warned that their mansabs would be reduced if they remained inactive against frequent thefts in the town. See Akhbārāt, dated Ist Safar 10th year Aurangzeb.

exercised in matters concerning the *qila'* and its administration.[1] Similarly, the *Kotwāl* could not interfere in matters coming within the competence of the *faujdār*.[2]

KOTWĀL AS CRIMINAL JUDGE:

European travellers have described the *Kotwāl* as 'city magistrate', 'criminal judge' *etc*.[3] But, it is not clear from their accounts what exactly his judicial powers were. Usually, a town or city was never without a *Kotwāl* and a *qāzī*; and therefore, the cases of serious criminal nature could hardly be filed in the court of the former when the latter was already there. From numerous references on record, however, it may fairly be agreed that in the minor cases and petty irregularities, the *Kotwāl* had judicial

---

1. *Akhbārāt*, document No. 2569, dated 12th Rabī I, 28th year Aurangzeb.

2. Contrary to this, the Faujdārs were always instructed, asked or requested to help the Kotwāls of the towns lying within their jurisdiction. See *Khutūt-i-Mahārājgān*, Bundle No.4, document No. 669, dated 25th Zilhijja 38th year of Aurangzeb. The writer of this *Khutūt* (whose name is not given) requests the Rāja Bishan Singh, the Faujdār of Mathura, to help Allāhābād who was appointed Kotwāl of Mathura; See also Thevenot, pp. 28-29.

3. See Manrique, I, p.418; Thevenot, p.27; Pelsaert, p.57; Manucci, I, pp. 197-198; II, pp. 420-421. According to Mundy "The Common Justice is called a cuttwall (Kotwāl) which are in every cities and towne." Mundy, II, 233.

powers. For instance it was reported from *pargana* Unhel, *sarkār* Ujjain (*sūba* Mālwa) [redacted] that one Mohan had two wives who used to quarrel almost daily. The man took them to the *Kotwālī* and lodged a complaint with the *Kotwāl*. Both the wives were put in the lock up for three days. On fourth day, the *Kotwāl* sent for both the women and interrogated and on finding both of them guilty severely whipped them and after sometime got them released on assurance that they would not quarrel again. Mohan had to pay one rupee on account of expenses for keeping his wives in *chabutra*. The rupee was deposited in government treasury.[1]

Similarly, in another case, the *Kotwāl* acted as a criminal judge. The *Waqāi Sarkār Rāmgarh*, dated 28th February 1662, reported that one Chānd, a native of Buxar, under the influence of drink, snatched Deval's (one of former's companion) sword and wounded him, for which he was taken into custody by the *Kotwāl*. When the wounds of Deval healed up, Chānd was set free and he was ordered by the *Kotwāl* to pay a sum of Rs. 2 to Deval as compensation.[2] The English Factors at Broach wrote that certain English men at Broach went out of the town during the night without the permission of the *Kotwāl*. On

---

1. *Akhbārāt*, document No. 660, dated 24th Rabī II, 1116 A.H.
2. See *Selected Waqāi*, pp. 78-79.

being informed of this, the Kotwāl seized them and had them mercilessly beaten; a little later they were released.[1] The Waqāʼi Aurangābād, dated Ist March, 1663, reported that three men named Mān, Dāud and Sāhu came to chauk bāzār, Aurangābād, for selling clothes. One Premjī came to the Kotwāl and reported that the clothes brought by them for sale was stolen property. The Kotwāl thereupon got all the three imprisoned and their clothes seized.[2] The cases related above and many others of the similar nature confirm [redacted] that the Kotwāl had judiciary powers in petty criminal cases and he could dispose of them even without letting them known to the governor or the qāzī. The nature of these cases was such that it required an immediate disposal of them while the procedure of the qāzī's court was complex and time-consuming. Therefore, it was natural on the part of the Kotwāl to assume certain judiciary powers, although there is no reference in official sources to any judicial powers expressly assigned to the Kotwāl.

CHABUTRA-I-KOTWĀLĪ:

The building possessed by the Kotwāl for his office and residence was known as 'Imārat-i-Kotwālī.'[3] It was usually

---

1. EF (1622-23), p. 258.
2. Selected Waqāʼi, p.61.
3. See Mutafarriq Mahārājgan, B.No.I, document No.163, Shaʻbān 38th year of Aurangzeb; Vakil Report, B.No.8, Document No. 224, dated 24th Jumāda II, 35th year of Aurangzeb.

situated in the middle of the town and bordering the main road near the chauk (cross-roads).[1] It was a government building, but sometimes also rented from private persons.[2] It contained the Chabutra (or chotra) a raised platform in front;[3] the bandī khāna[4] (prison) and a few store rooms used for keeping temporarily the mahsūl collected at the Chabutra, the stolen and contraband goods brought to the market for sale but seized by the men of Kotwāl[5] and the intestate property and unclaimed articles found on the road.[6] The subordinate officials attached to the Kotwālī sat with their desks in front in these rooms.[7] The Chabutra-i-Kotwālī used to serve various purposes.

---

1. Thevenot, p.12; Sarkar, Mughal Administration, p.61.
2. Akhbārāt, document No.68, dated 7th Zīlqáda 1104 A.H.
3. Thevenot, p.12; Mirāt, I, p.282.
4. Mirāt, I, 282; Waqāi-i-Ajmer, I,p.232; Ma'āsir-i-Ālamgīrī, p.260.
5. See Mutafarriq Mahārājgan, B.No.I, document No.163, Shábān 38th year of Aurangzeb; see Vakīl Report B.No.9 document No.977 dated 21 Ramzan 1106 A.H.; Selected Waqāi, p.61. Mirāt, I, 168.
6. Ibid., p. 169.
7. For mushrif, see Mirāt (Suppl.), pp.178,283; Jawāhar Nāth Bekās, ff. 27b,28a; For dārogha, see Mirāt (Suppl.), pp. 182-183; For Amīn see Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, f. 156ab; Akhbārāt p.182 dated 11th Rabī II, 48th year of Aurangzeb, Ibid, dated 29th Rabī I, 26th year; For Karorī, see Mirāt (Suppl.) p.183; For tahwīldār, see Mirāt (Suppl.), p.183; For Waqāinavīs, see Dastūral 'amal, B.M. add. No.6599, 37b; Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, 240 ab.

It was, first of all, the Kotwal's office (Kachehrī). After attending the court of justice or public audience, if any, called by the Emperor or the ṣūbahdār etc. for most of the time during the day the Kotwāl used to sit in the Chabutra[1] and it was from here that he discharged his principal duties. Here he was attended by a large number of peons (piyādas) and horsemen, armed with swords, lances, bows and arrows, fetters and lashes, iron rods and whips.[2] When a man was brought under arrest to the Chabutra by his men or revenue collectors or on accusation by a plaintiff, the Kotwāl personally inquired into his case.[3] If he was innocent, the Kotwāl was to protect him in the Chabutra and got him released without delay.[4] If some one had a legal suit against him, the Kotwāl used to advise him to resort to a court of justice.[5] If there was any case of the crownland revenue department against him, the instructions to the Kotwāl were to report the fact to the ṣūbahdār,[6] and to take a sanad from

---

1. For the multifarious duties and responsibilities assigned to him, see Akbar's farmān Mirāt I, pp. 168-169-170; Āin, op.cit.
2. See Ovington, p.137; Manucci, Vol.II, pp.295-6; Mirāt (Suppl.) p.178; Thevenot, p.27.
3. Mirāt, I, p.282; Akbarnāma, III, p.759. The Akbarnāma informs that Malik Khairullāh Khān, the Kotwāl of Lāhore, when was examining a thief in his private room, the latter managed to kill the Kotwāl and his son.
4. Mirāt, I, p.282.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.

him and then to act accordingly. Till then, the accused was kept in the lock-up.[1] If any body was sent by the qāzī for detention, the man was kept in custody on obtaining a signed order of the qāzī. And if the qāzī had fixed a date for his trial, the Kotwāl was to send the man, after the expiry of that period, to the qāzī's court; and in case the trial in his case was not over or was postponed, it was the Kotwāl's responsibility to send and bring back the under-trial detenu every day so that his case might quickly be decided.[2]

At the Chabutra, the Kotwāl had to spend a very bus day. There were no fixed hours of duty. He had to be on duty round the clock.[3] In the morning, and also in the even he was regularly visited by the mīr-i-mahalla, the spy, th watchmen and the sweepers from every mahalla and market pl to convey to him news of all that happened the previous ni and the day just passed.[4] After receiving the reports from above mentioned and giving them necessary instructions, the Kotwāl used to inspect the bandīkhāna where those found innocent

1. Mirāt, I, p. 282.

2. Ibid.

3. Mirāt, I, pp. 168-170. The regulations for the Kotwāl laid down in Akbar's farmān are sufficient to prove that he was a very busy official.

4. See Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn, f. 30ab; Mirāt I, pp. 168-169; Badāonī, ii, p. 390; Guldasta-i-Sultanat, p. 34a; Jawāhar Nāth Bekas, ff. 26b-27ab.

by him were to be released immediately and the guilty heavily guarded.[1] In the meantime, if there was any report or news of unwanted happenings such as murder, theft, fight and arson etc., he had to rush to the spot immediately along with his force.[2] Besides this, the surprise visits (during day time) at various places for hunting down the suspects could be undertaken any moment.[3] This was in addition to this routine patrolling during night.

At the Chabutra-i-Kotwālī, a large crowd of men could be seen throughout the day. Some having come to lodge complaints,[4] others to bring back a person just released,[5] others to get an accused released on bail,[6] the strangers for seeking entry into the town,[7] the prisoners coming and going to the court of justice[8] and also sometimes a large number of spectators gathered to see an accused punished.[9]

---

1. See Aurangzeb's farmān containing thirty-three sections, Mirāt, I, pp. 282-83.
2. See MS. Fraser, 124 ff. 469b 570a and also 170b-171a.
3. Khāfī Khān, II, pp.203-204; Shāhjahān Nāma, p.327; Akhbārāt document No.1525, dated 23th Shawwāl, 25th year of Aurangzeb Selected Waqāi, p.51; Manucci, II, p.6.
4. See Vakil Report, B.No.8 document No.224 dated 24th Jumāda, II, 35th year Aurangzeb.
5. Akhbarat, document No.660, dated 24th Rabī, II, 1116 A.H., see Pieter Van Den Broeke pp. 205-6.
6. Manucci was released on bail given by a Hindu, see Manucci, II, pp. 184-506.
7. Letter's Received, I, p.277.
8. According to the rules, an accused was to be sent every day to the court of qazi so that his case might be disposed off speedily. See Mirāt, I, p.283.
9. Akhbārāt, dated 24th Zilqa'da 1111 A.H. The punishment as rule was inflicted in open at Chabutra, in street and also at the place of occurrence of the crime in order to teach others not to commit crimes. See Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī, p.243; Akhbārāt, dated 3rd Sha'bān, 1111 A.H.

TORTURE & EXECUTIONS:

Several type of punishments used to be inflicted at the Chabutra-i-Kotwālī and in the presence of the Kotwāl. The punishments, stretching from the slightest i.e. receiving few whips[1] to hanging depended upon the crimes and the law applied to them. The Kotwāl could never punish any one at his own discretion so far as serious crimes were concerned. Whatever orders were passed in various criminal and civil cases and in the case prisoners of war, he had to execute them. In one of the case, reports Fryer, 16 highway robbers, "were advanced .... half a foot from the ground; and then cutting their legs off that the blood might flow from them, they left them miserable spectacles, hanging till they dropped of their own accord."[2] In an other case, reports the Tuzuk, a thief at Ahmadābād five times was punished with the mutilation of a part of the body once his right hand, next the thumb of the left hand, third left ear, fourth with hamstringing and fifth, cutting of the nose. Even then, he did not leave his habit and one night got into the house of a grass-cutter. He killed the owner of the house but himself was being overpowered by the relatives of the murdered. They brought him to the Kotwāl. Later on the thief was presented to Emperor Jahāngīr and the

1. EF. (1624-29), p. 258.

2. Fryer, I, p.244.

whole story was related. The Emperor thereupon handed over the thief to the relatives of the grass-cutter to be treated by them as they pleased.[1] In 1684, 112 servants of Sambhāji, who were declared prisoners of war, were executed at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.[2] In 1682, ten spies of Sambhāji were ordered by the Emperor to be executed at Kotwālī.[3] In 1704, in another case, Khanzād Khān brought four prisoners of war to the presence of the Emperor who sent them to Sarbrāh Khān, the Kotwāl, to be given capital punishment then and there.[4]

BANDĪKHĀNA:

The square rooms around the Chabutra were used as bandīkhāna where all the guilty persons, whatever their crimes, were kept.[5] The confinment of prisoners here was of a temporary nature, except for those accused sent by the Nāzim or by the Qāzī.[6] They were kept in a lock up till their trial was over. Otherwise, those guilty of minor crimes were normally

---

1. Tuzuk, p.116.
2. Ma'āsir-i-Ālamgīrī, p. 243.
3. Akhbārāt, dated 8th Jumāda II, 1093 A.H.
4. Ibid., dated 7th Zilhijja, 1116 A.H.
5. See Manrique, I, pp. 421,22; Ibid., II, pp. 113,326; Mundy I, p.286; Badāoni, I, p.223; Mirāt, I, pp.282-283; Shams Sirāj 'Afif, p. 569.
6. Fryer, I, p.246; Terry, p.366; Akhbārāt, document No.1380 dated 20th Safar, 24th year Aurangzeb.

released after three days of repentance.[1] The *bandikhana* was looked after by a *bandivan* (*jailor*).[2] There were certain other employees of the *bandikhana* to assist the *jailor*, namely, the *ahadi* (cavalry trooper) *mashalchi* (torch bearers) *nishan bardar* (standard-bearers), *qurchi* (guards) and *balan-tariyan* (the holders of musical instrument for announcement etc.). All these were appointed at the recommendation of the *Kotwal* and received salaries from the *Chabutra-i-Kotwali*.[3] In the prison, there was proper arrangement for board and lighting at the cost of the government.[4] When a person was released, the *Kotwal* used to charge something from him on account of expenses incurred for his being kept and looked after while in the lock up.[5]

COLLECTION OF TAXES AT CHABUTRA-I-KOTWALI:

In big cities the *Chabutra-i-Kotwali* in itself constituted a separate *mahal* and the *mahsul* collected there to-

1. See Ovington, p.137; Manrique, ii, pp.250-251; *Selected Waqai*, pp. 78-79; Manucci, Vol. II, pp.184, 185, 186; *Akhbarat*, document No.660, dated 24th Rabi II, 1116 A.H.

2. See *Selected document* (Shahjahan) p.118; *Siyaha Waqai*, dated 27th Rabi, II, 1054 A.H. *Monserrate*, p.206.

3. See *Selected Document* (Shahjahan) p.118.

4. *Selected Document* (Shahjahan) p. 118.

5. *Akhbarat* document No.660, dated 24th Rabi II, 1116 A.H.

gether with that of a number of mahāls (collectively known as mahālāt-i-sāir) formed part of the entire Jamadāmī of the city.[1] In small towns, on the other hand, the entire mahsūl (sāir ijhāt) levied was collected only at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.[2] For example, in one Vakil Report dated 30th regnal year of Aurangzeb, the Mahārāja (of Amber), who was both the faujdār and jāgīrdār of pargana qasba Islāmābād (Mathura), was informed that "from the beginning of the year above-mentioned, the mahsūl mahāl sāir has been included in the Khālisa and therefore, the Kotwāl has been required to obey the rules of the department of the Khālisa sharīfa and not of the Mahārāja with regard to the collection of mahsūl mahāl sāir."[3] This clearly shows that at Mathura the Kotwāl was responsible for collecting mahsūl mahāl sāir. At Ahmadābād, the income from the betel-leaf market amounting to 114,000 dām was attached to the Kotwālī.[4] At qasba Seha, sarkār Ujjain (sūba Mālwa), the mahsul-i-hāt (tax on periodical market) was realized at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.[5]

---

1. MS. Fraser 124, ff.94a,97b,98a,123a; Dastūr Shāhjahānī, Add. 6588, f.23a; Dastūr, Add. 6599, f.28a; Vakil Report, Bundle No.7, document No.596, dated 30th year of Aurangzeb; Ibid., Bundle No.4, document No.559, dated 21st Shawwāl, 1105 A.H., Mirāt (Suppl.) pp.180,181,182,183,184.

2. See Khulāsat-us-Siyāq, ff. 77a,78b,79a; Akhbārāt, document No. 600, dated 13th Rabī II, 1116 A.H.

3. Vakil Report, Bundle No.7 document No. 596, dated 30th year of Aurangzeb.

4. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.183.

5. Akhbārāt, document No.600, dated 13th Rabī, II, 1116 A.H.

The mujmal[1] (an abstract account) of the Jama' and Kharch of māl-o-jihāt and sāir-jihāt collected at pargana and qasba Kīratpūr, sūba Panjāb, for the fasli Rabī, given in the Khulāsat-us-Siyāq, shows that the above qasba was a small one, and there did not exist any mahāl other than Chabutra-i-Kotwālī. The entire mahsūl-i-sāir amounting to Rs. 477-0-0 was collected at the Chabutra-i-Kotwālī. In addition to the mahsūl (toll charges) on various commodities brought for sale in the market, a large amount collected at river ferries,[2] the rents realized from houses and shops,[3] and the money collected in the form of fine in various criminal cases etc. all formed part of the mahsūl mahāl Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.[4] The income to the Imperial treasury from this mahāl was quite considerable and perhaps larger than any other single mahāl of the mahālāt-i-sāir as shown in the jama' of most of the towns or cities of the Mughal Empire. The figures, showing

---

1. Khulāsat-us-Siyāq, ff. 83ab, 84a. Elsewhere too in the Khulāsat-us-Siyāq, under the head sāir jihāt only the mahsūl realized at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī is given, see f.79a.

2. Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, ff. 238ab, 239ab.

3. Akhbārāt, document No.68, dated 6 & 7th Zilhija, 1104 A.H. According to this Akhbārāt, the Kotwāl was to look after the repairs and to collect the rent of all the Khālisa buildings.

4. Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī, p.53; Jawāhar Nāth Bekās, ff.27b, 28a.

the *mahṣūl mahāl Chabutra-i-Kotwāli* or some of the towns, large and small, are given below:

City or town	Mahṣūl collected at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī	Total collection (Hāṣil) of the entire city town or pargana (including qasba)	Other relevent information
Cambay [1]	Rs.7000-0-0		
Burhānpūr [2]	Rs.4741-0-0	306202-5-0	Hāṣil of the entire city collected at 35 mahāls including Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.
Aurangābād [3]	Rs. 574-8-0	482195-1-0	Hāṣil of the entire city collected 34 mahāls including Kotwālī.
Kīratpūr [4] (Ṣuba Panjāb)	Rs. 477-0-0	50455-0-0	Hāṣil of the entire pargana and qasba Kīratpūr including both māl-o-jihāt and sāir-jihāt.

The Mahāl Chabutra-i-Kotwālī along with mahāl sāir (or mahālāt-i-sāir balda) sometimes was included in the Khāliṣa and

1. See MS. Fraser 124, f. 94a.
2. Dastūr-al 'amal Shahnshāhī, B.M. Add. 22831, f. 23a; Khulāṣatul Hind, p.94.
3. Ibid., pp. 127-128.
4. Khulāṣat-us-Siyāq, f. 79a.

sometimes given in assignment.[1] When the *Kotwālī* was retained in the *Khālisa*, the *Kotwāl* had to obey the rules and regulations of the *daftar dīwānī Khālisa*[2] and the officials attached to the *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī*, such as *dārogha*, *amīn*, *karorī*, *mushrif*, *mutasaddīs* etc. were appointed through Imperial *sanads* bearing the seal of *dīwān-i-ala*, on the recommendation of *dīwān-i-sūba*.[3] The entire *mahsūl* collected at the *Kotwālī* was to be deposited in the treasury, the *Baitul Māl*.[4] When on the other hand, the *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī* was given in assignment, the *Kotwāl* and the tax collectors were agents of the assignee and had to obey his instructions.[5]

The author of the *Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī*, while recommending the inclusion of the *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī* of the city of Thaṭṭa into *Khālisa*, argues that "the *Kotwālī* of Thaṭṭa in accordance

---

1. See *Mirāt* (Suppl.), pp. 181-182; *Vakīl Report*, Bundle 4, document No. 559, dated 21st Shauwāl 1105 A.H.; ibid., B.8, document No. 161, dated 21 Sha'bān, 32nd year of Aurangzeb; *Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan*, B.No. Document No.669 dated 25 Zilqada 38th year of Aurangzeb.

2. *Vakīl Report*, B.7, document No. 596, dated 30th year Aurangzeb.

3. *Mirāt*, (Suppl.) p.183.
4. *Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī*, p.53.

5. *Vakīl Report*, Bundle No.4, document No.559, dated 21st Shauwāl 1105 A.H.; *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.182; *Mutaffariq Mahārājgan*, Bundle No.3, document No. 578, dated 18th Ramzan 1121 A.H.; Ibid, document No.1706, 1126 A.H.; Mundy, II, p. 371. Mundy informs that the Kotwāl at Patna (1620-21) was an agent of Muqarrab Khān, the governor, and the former monopolized the sale of skin, silk on behalf of the latter.

with the former practice be ordered to be taken into the Khālisa. For, this would be of benefit to the residents of the city. Because, whenever the Chabutra-i-Kotwālī was assigned to the Nāzim-i-sūba, it added to the miseries of the people .... and they should never collect the Jurmāna (fines) beyond what the shariát permits." He further points out that, "if the Chabutra-i-Kotwālī was made Shahanshāhī (i.e. put in Khālisa) the Jurmāna from the people might be realized in accordance with the rules laid down in the Shar'.. Kotwālī be shāhanshāhī .... it is an important thing."[1]

ABWĀB REALIZED AT CHABUTRA-I-KOTWĀLĪ:

In addition to the legal taxes and Jurmāna (fines), collected at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī, a large number of abwāb (cesses) used to be realized in the towns by the Kotwāl's men, of which no record was kept and for which there was no uniform schedule of rates nor a fixed number.[2] Sometimes they

1. Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī, p.53.

2. There could be no fixed number or rate for abwab. They were charged secretly and much depended upon an opportunity or whatever was agreed upon between the payee and the payer. For example, rāhdārī sometimes was exacted per maund and sometimes per cart and also in the form of lumpsum as the case settled. In one case, at Mathura the agents of Kotwāl charged from merchant named Gajāfil Rs.40 for 7 carts. See Vakil Report, Bundle No.8, document No. 101, dated 21st Shabān 32rd year of Aurangzeb. In an other case, also at Mathura Rs.2 per cart were charged. See

Contd.......

were realized as per custom;[1] but exactions by the simple use of force were not excluded.[2] Almost all the officials posted at *Chabutra* had their share in such collections.[3]

1. *RĀHDĀRĪ*:

There are numerous complaints on record with regard to the *rāhdārī* collected at *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī*.[4] Large number

---

(Continued from the previous page)

Akhbārāt, document No.3318, dated 8th Ziīqa'da, 39th year. At pargana Unhel, sarkār Ujjain, the agent of Kotwal exacted one rupee per ox load. See *Akhbārāt*, document No. 692, dated 29th Jumāda, I, 49th year of Aurangzeb. Again at Mathura, Allahadād, the Kotwāl, realized four and half takas per horse from Kām Deo Beopārī who was taking horses from Shāhjahānābād to Āgra for sale. See *Akhbārāt*, document No.420, dated 20th Rajab, 1046 A.H. *Mirāt*, I, 286.

1. The cesses, which became customary by practice, used to collected openly and with the approval of high officials. According to one report from Aurangābād, the Kotwāl, Abdullāh Beg reported to Diyānat Khān, the dīwān, that Rs.1¼ and 3 tankas per ox load was levied on cloths brought into the city by merchants to government warehouse and if the same quantity of cloth was carried out of the city for sale the charges were Rs.3 and tankas 3. The above dīwan directed the Kotwāl to let continue the customary levies. See *Selected Document* (Shāhjahān), p.125.

2. *Akhbārāt*, document No.3311, dated 10th Jumāda II, 38th year, Jayanti Sāhukār complained to Fidāī Khān (Nazim Suba Lāhore) that he was arrested by Lāl Chand the Kotwāl of Jai Singh pura at Chabutra without cause; and the men of Chabutra by force took from him 56 āshrafī, one Kantha (some ornament worn in the neck) and a shawl. See also *Akhbārāt*, document No.3279, dated 9th Safar 37th year. For general complaint of the merchants from Mathura, Etawa etc. against the exaction of *rāhdārī* perforce by the agents of the Faujdārs of the above Chaklas, see *Akhbārāt*, document No.3317, dated 14th Shawwāl 39th year of Aurangzeb.
3. *Akhbārāt*, dated 25 Rabī, II, 49th year of Aurangzeb.
4. *Mirāt*, I, pp.259-286; *Waqāi-i-Ajmer*, I, p.183; *Akhbārāt*, document No.3810, dated, 20th Rajab, 28th year of Aurangzeb; *Ibid.*, document No.1942, date worm eaten; *Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan*, document No.1221, dated 50th year of Aurangzeb.

of *Waqāi'* (reports) allege that the main cause of the rise in the prices of grain was the realization of *rāhdārī* on the grain, clothes etc. brought to the market for sale.[1] For fear of *rāhdārī* sometimes no merchant or *banjāra* dared bring grain to the market.[2] There was no fixed rate for *rāhdārī*. It could be charged per maund; per cart or ox-load and also in the form of a lumpsum.[3]

2. TAH-BĀZĀRI:

Ground rent on stalls in the market, collected by the *Kotwāl*. Whenever somebody brought vegetables and grain etc. to the *bāzār* for sale, the *Kotwāl*'s men used to take some quantity of that and send that to the house of the *Kotwāl*.[4]

3. PANDĀRI:

In large towns such as Āgra, Delhi, Lāhore, Burhānpūr and others, duty called *Pandārī* was levied on all articles of food and drink brought in from outside for sale.[5]

---

1. Akhbārāt, document No. 3317, dated 14th Shauwāl, 39th year.

2. Akhbārāt, document No. 3451, dated 37 Zilqada. 28th year, Ibid. document No. 2838, dated 20th Ramzan, 29th year.

3. See foot-note No. I, on the above page, see also Mirāt, I, p.286.
4. Khwāja Yāsīn, Glossary, 'Purnea Ms'. f. 63a.
5. 'Ālamgīrnāma, pp. 436-438.

4. "When a man, mentions the *Mirāt*, brings any kind of animal to Ahmadābād or its *pūras* for sale, exaction are made from him thrice; first at entry (*āmdanī*); second at sale (*firūkhtanī*); and, third, if the animal remains unsold and the man wishes to take it back then a duty upon exit (*raftanī*).[1]"

5. When carts loaded with grain or other articles were due to leave the city, the officials took Rs. 2 per cent at *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī*, under the name of *Chhatī*.[2]

6. In *qasba* Dholqa, when a man wanted to pull down his house and sell the material, the *Kotwāl* used to take three *tankas* for every thousand bricks which used to be sold for one rupee.[3]

7. " If some one buys a cow or a buffalo for birthday celebration or a feast, its sale tax, says the *Mirāt*, is collected in the *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī*. It was previously ordered that one-fortieth of the current present price from a Muslim and two-fortieth from a Hindu should be taken as sale tax;

---

1. *Mirāt*, I, 262.

2. *Ibid*., p. 263. According to Mandelslo, the merchants at Ahmadābād, had to pay no custom on the export or import of goods. They paid, however, fifteen pence per wagon to the Kotwāl of the place, see Mandelslo, p. 28.

3. *Mirāt*, I, p.262.

and they (the men of Kotwāl) should not trouble people on any other account."[1]

8. Rusūm-i-Kotwālī:[2]

Cesses collected for the Kotwāl.

9. Chungī Gosht:

A cess on mutton, collected at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.[3]

10. Tarāzū Kashī - a tax on weights - iron or stone, levied at the time of officially stamping them.[4]

11. Tax on marriages:

Badāonī mentions that no son or daughter of the common people could be married until they had gone to the office of the Kotwāl and been seen by his agents and the correct age of both the parties had been investigated. From this function a host of perquisites surpassing all computation were exacted by men of the Kotwāl's office. But after Akbar this regulation seems to have become a dead-letter; and so the remuneration from this also probably ceased.

12. "Something to Kotwāl for eating betal was necessary", write the Eng.Fact. from Ahmadābād, "so we agreed with him

1. Mirāt, I, p.262.

2. Ibid., p.287; see also Zawābit-i-Ālamgīrī, f.136a; Hālāt-i-Mumālik Mahrūsa Ālamgīrī, Add.6598, ff.189ab, 199a.

3. Mirāt, I, 287.

4. Ibid.

5. Badāonī, II, p.391.

for 25 rupees ..... it being a custome that all which come in the common prison must pay or have their clothes torne from their bodies."[1]

13. Tax on Widows:

At Qamarnagar (Kurnul), the Kotwāl used to charge one rupee by way of zulm abwāb from the widows.[2]

14. The Kotwāl[3] of Jodhpūr used to charge 3 rupees monthly from shoe-makers.

OFFICIALS AT THE CHABUTRA:

A number of officials are mentioned as working at, or attached to, the Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.

MUSHRIF:

He was treasurer appointed by imperial sanad bearing the seal of the dīwān-i-ālā, on the recommendation of the provincial dīwān.[4] At Ahmadābād, his pay was Rs.40 a month; and in addition to his duties at the Chabutra-i-Kotwālī, he held the post of mushrif-i-maḥāl pāndariba (betel market) and

---

1. EF (1622-23), p.73; Manrique, ii, pp.280-81; EF (1624-29) pp.282-3; Akhbārāt, document No.3311, dated 10th Jumāda II, 38th year Aurangzeb.
2. Akhbārāt, document No.21, dated 12th Ẕilqada, 39th year Aurangzeb.
3. See Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, p.206; Akhbārāt, dated 27th Sha'bān 1114 A.H.
4. Mirāt (Suppl.) p.183.

of the *daftar khāna dīvānī*.[1] At *pargana* and *qasba* Islāmnagar, *Sarkār* Sambhal (*sūba* Shāhjahānābād), the *mushrif Chabutra-i-Kotwālī* was the *dārogha-i-mahāl sāir* as well.[2] His work was to receive the cash and keep the money collected at *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī* by way of taxes, fines, *shukrāna* (fee) and other legal exactions.[3]

DĀROGHA:

He was a *mansabdār* appointed by *dīvān-i-sūba* to superintend the octroi posts around the city.[4] At Ahmadābād he also served as the *dārogha* of *mahāl sāir* and *mahāl katrapārcha*.[5]

AMĪN:

He supervised the work of *mutasaddis* attached to the *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī* and was supposed to ensure that the officials of the *Kotwālī* did not harass or oppress the merchants and all those who came to the market, on account of illegal exactions. He was a *mansabdār* and at ~~that~~ times held the office of the *amin* of two or more than two *mahāls*.[6] At Burhānpūr, the *Amīn*

---

1. *Ibid.*
2. Jawāhar Nāth Bekās, ff. 27b-28a.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Mirāt* (Suppl.) p.183.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 182.
6. *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī*, f.156-ab. At Lāhore the *amin Chabutra-i-Kotwālī* was also the dārogha-i-peth-nakhāsa and Karorī mahal sair. See *Akhbārāt*, p.182, dated 11th Rabī II, 48th year Aurangzeb.; *Ibid.*, dated 29th Rabī I, 26th year.

Chabutra-i-Kotwālī was also the Chaudharī or headman of the mandi of Shāhganj.[1]

KARORĪ:

He was apparently the tax collector appointed by imperial sanad, on the recommendation of the provincial dīwān.[2] The duties of this official, attached to the Chabutra, are not described anywhere.

TAHWĪLDĀR:

The cashier, appointed by imperial sanad and on the recommendation of the provincial dīwān, was the keeper of the treasury.[3] At Ahmadabad, in addition to his duties at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī, he held the office of tahwīldār of daftar khāna dīwānī and mahāl kirāya dukān (shop-rents).[4]

WAQĀʾINAVĪS:

There are many references to the waqāʾinavīs being appointed at Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.[5] At Shāhjahānābād the waqāʾinavīs attached to the Kotwālī, also held the posts of

1. Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, f. 156ab.

2. Mirʾāt (Suppl.) p.183.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Dastūr-al-amal (Ālamgīrī), Add. No. 6599, f.37b; Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī, p. 174.

amin and nirikhnavis (price-reporter) of the tobacco market. He was appointed by the Imperial sanad. His main duty was to write secret reports and daily news-reports to the headquarters, the provincial subahdar and the divan separately. He was also to see that the Kotwali officials did not oppress or harass the merchants and others, who came to the market, on account of illegal exactions. If he found any one indulging in oppression, he was to report the case to the headquarters.[1] In one document, the Waqa'inavis is reported to have been bribed by the Kotwal not to write the actual report.[3]

THE MUTASADDIS:

They were clerks appointed by the divan-i suba. Various official papers such siyaha, roznamcha, tumar, asl khari, asl jama', siyaha-i kharid-o firukht etc. used to be prepared by them. They were also to help in the collection of taxes.[4]

PIYADAS:

There used to be several piyadas (peons) posted at the Chabutra-i Kotwali. Their main function was that of watch and

---

1. Nigarnama-i-Munshi, f. 240ab.
2. Khutut-i-Maharaigan, document No.65, dated 23rd Zilqada 25th year of Alamgira.
3. See Vakil Report Bundle No.3, document No.161, dated, 21st Shaban, 32 year of Aurangzeb.
4. Ibid.

ward, and rendering assistance in the collection of taxes. They were always to be at the beck and call of the *Kotwāl*.[1]

NĀ'IB KOTWĀL:

A deputy (*nā'ib*) of the *Kotwāl* was to work on behalf of the *Kotwāl*.[2] There is no reference in the records of the *nā'ib-kotwāl* being directly appointed by the Imperial government. It appears that the *Kotwāl* himself could appoint a man his deputy to work in his absence.[3] It is not known what exactly his powers and duties were. It is most probable that he could exercise only such duties as were delegated by the ~~*Kotwāl*, and never acted~~ at his own discretion.[4] A deputy *Kotwāl* was needed only when the *Kotwāl* was absent, on sick-bed,[5] or on long leave, or out of station for official business.[6]

---

1. See *Mir'āt*, I, p.334; Fryer, I, p.249; *Zawābit-i-Ālamgīrī*, f.23; *Pādshāhnāma*, II, p.21; Manrique II, p.137.

2. *Mutafarriq Mahārājgan*, Bundle No.3, No.578, dated 18th Ramzan 1121 A.H.; *Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan*, document No.1706, dated 1126 A.H.

3. *Akhbārāt*, dated 7th Zilhijja, 1115 A.H.

4. *Mutafarriq Maharajgan*, B.No.3, document No. 578, dated 18th Ramzan, 1121 A.H.; *Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan*, document No. 1706, dated 1126 A.H.

5. *Ibid*.

6. *Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan*, document No.1706, dated 1126 A.H.

KOTWĀL AND QĀZĪ:

The Qāzī was superior to the Kotwāl in the bureaucratic hierarchy as well as in judicial matters.[1] The Kotwāl was bound to obey the written and sealed orders of the qāzī and attended his court regularly.[2] The suspected persons brought under arrest by the Kotwāl's men were to be produced in the qāzīs court as soon as possible.[3] Moreover, the Kotwāl was never permitted to interfere in matters relating to the Sharīʿat.[4] But on the other hand, without the Kotwāl's co-operation, the qāzī's authority was quite inadequate. He could not get his orders or decision executed if the Kotwāl chose to ignore them. He could not order for the release of the prisoner, kept in Kotwāl's custody, without previously

---

1. Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, ff. 238ab, 239a; Manucci, II, pp. 295-6.

2. Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, ff. 143b, 114a; Mirāt, I, pp. 283; Akhbārāt, document No. 3293, dated 8th Shawwāl, 38th year of Aurangzeb; Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, f. 64a.

3. Akhbārāt, document No. 1297, dated 30th Jumāda I, 24th year of Aurangzeb.

4. From Akbarābād, it was reported to Aurangzeb that the Kotwāl, Bāzid, of Mathura (an agent of Rāja Bishan Singh the faujdār of the place) was meddling in the Sharīʿat affairs and paid no head to the advice given by the Qāzī. Thereupon, the chief bakhshī, Ruhrahmand Khān, was directed from the headquarters to write to Rāja Bishan Singh to transfer the Kotwāl and appoint another in his place. See Akhbārāt, dated 6th Jumāda II, 1109 A.H.; see also MS. Fraser 124, f. 236b.

informing the latter.[1] In the Mughal administration it was clearly expected that both the qāzī and kotwāl would work with mutual understanding and co-operation.[2] Nevertheless, there is evidence of difference of opinion between the two over matters relating to their jurisdictions. For example, it was reported from Āgra that the Kotwāl of Āgra released a certain murderer, who was also a notorious theif. The matter was reported to the qāzī. He took grave objection to it and sent an order to the Kotwāl asking him "what authority you have to release a murderer without my written and sealed order? You have no jurisdiction over cases of theft and murder."[3] Still in another case, the qāzī of Mathura also took objection to what the Kotwāl had done. It so happened that two merchants named Nizāmuddīn and Ma'fūruddīn, while on their way with large merchandise from Delhi to Āgra, were robbed at Sarāi Chhāta near Mathura. They petitioned to the qāzī of Mathura and the

---

1. It was reported from the Royal court that orders had been issued to the qazis of the Empire desiring them not to give orders for the release of prisoners without prior informing the Kotwāl. For this practice created mismanagement. See Akhbārāt, document No. 101, dated 7th Ziiqada, 1106 A.H.

2. It was reported from Akbarābād that weavers there inscribed verses of Qurān over shawls. The qāzī took objections to this practice and he got it checked by the Kotwāl Yārbeg. See Akhbārāt, document No.3203, dated 16th Rajab, 36th year of Aurangzeb.

3. Intikhāb Siyāha Waqāi' Huzūr Nāzim Sūba Akbarābād, Document No. 3319, dated 10th Ziiqada, 39th year 'Ālamgīrī.

latter ordered the Kotwāl Sidi-Allāh to search for the thieves and restore the stolen property to the complainants. The property in question (which was worth one lākh) was recovered and it was restored to the merchant by the order of the qāzī. A little later, the Kotwāl sent his men to bring back the entire property just restored to the merchants. This happened in the dark hours of the night and the property was locked up at Chabutra. When the matter was reported to the qāzī, he wrote to the Kotwāl saying, "What authority you have to act in this way? The property has been restored to the above merchants by my orders and at my security and I am responsible for whatever loss there might be." A little later the matter subsided, and the property was restored to the owners.[1]

KOTWĀL AND MUHTASIB:

Frequently there are reports of conflict between the Kotwāl and the muhtasib. [redacted] The powers of both were not clearly and separately defined; moreover, certain duties, as noted earlier, relating to market supervision etc., hitherto performed by the Kotwāl, were now transferred to muhtasib. A few instances of such conflict come from Jodhpūr.

The muhtasib was not superior to the Kotwāl. He had no authority to order imprisonment of any one in the first

---

1. Vakīl Report, Bundle No.9, document No. 977, dated 21st Ramzan, 1106 A.H.

resort. He could report the matter to the qazi; and it was the qazi who passed orders that were to be enforced by the Kotwal. For instance, one day a piyada of Chabutra-i-Kotwali of Jodhpur whipped a labourer. The latter complained to the muhtasib who sent an order to the Kotwal to hand over the Piyada to him. The Kotwal, ignoring the order of the muhtasib, wrote back to him in reply, "you as muhtasib, have no right to send for my man. If the qazi summons him, I shall send him." The Muhtasib took objection to these words of the Kotwal and ordered twelve of his piyadas to go and fetch the piyada in question. The Kotwal alerted his men to fight back the men of muhtasib. A great fight could only be avoided when a large number of men came in between the two parties.[1]

In another case, Mukhlis Khan reported to the Emperor that Muhammad Amin, the deputy Kotwal, has petitioned that, "because of the fight among his men and the men of muhtasib, the latter got his men fined while there is no prima-facie case against them. Therefore, the fine may please be remitted." The fine was condemned.[2]

---

1. See Waqai-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 212-213.

2. Akhbarat, Vol.II, p.292 (the Akhbarat of this year (44th) are in book form - in four vols.) dated 20th Zilhijja, 44th year Aurangzeb.

To quote one more instance, a quarrel, between the *muhtasib* and the shopkeepers of the Jodhpūr city led to the closure of the entire market for two days. It was on the third day that, at the instance of the *Kotwāl*, the market could be opened.[1]

1. *Waqā'i-i-Ajmer*, I, p.199. At another occasion, Syed Bāqar, Muhtasib of Jodhpūr, kept several shopkeepers in custody for three days for selling contraband things (bang etc.) and later on took muchalkas from them to the effect that they would not sale bang etc. again. He also warned the drapers for not using approved yard and the other shopkeepers for not having proper weights. Lastly he warned the Kotwāl, Muhammad Rahim to treat it an important matter. But it is not known whether the Kotwāl took the warning of the Muhtasib seriously. See *Waqā'i-i-Ajmer*, I, p.183.

CHAPTER III

OTHER EXECUTIVE OFFICIALS

In this chapter we shall discuss the other Imperial officials who had administrative responsibility to maintain law and order around the town and at times took part in various ways in the internal administration of the town. They were *faujdār*, *thānadār*, *qil'adār*, *muhtasib*, *waqā'inavīs*, *khufianavīs* and *harkāra*.

Maintenance of law and order was recognised as the first duty of the government.[1] While the Governor had the duty of maintaining law and order in the province (*ṣūba*), at the next lower level —— either coincidental with the *sarkārs* or with jurisdictions cutting across *sarkār* boundaries —— it was the *faujdār* who had the task of doing so.

FAUJDĀR:

The *faujdār* was reckoned among the important officials in the administrative apparatus. The *Āīn* says that as a subordinate and assistant he held the first place.[2] Although he was subordinate to the provincial governors, he could have had direct communication with the Imperial court.[3] He was appointed by the Emperor through the *farmān-i-sabatī*.[4] According

1. *Āīn*, I, (*Havāi-i-Rozi*), pp. 289, 290,291,292,293-4.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 283.
3. P.Saran, *Provincial Administration*, p. 229.
4. *Ibid.*, *Maāsir-al-Umarā*, I, p.594.

to the Āin, he was assigned duties pertaining to three branches of administration, viz. revenue, police and military. On the revenue side he was only indirectly involved, i.e. he was to assist the 'amalguzār (revenue collector) in the realization of revenue from recalcitrant revenue-payers. His police duty was to guard the area under his jurisdiction and to inspect the local militia in order to keep it well equipped.[1]

According to the Bahār-i-Ajam, the faujdār was "the hākim around the city, like the Kotwāl inside the city."[2] He was held responsible for all thefts and dacoities committed in towns lying within his jurisdiction. We come across many occasions when the faujdārs were transferred[4] or dismissed,[5] their mansab reduced[6] or post down-graded[7] if they failed to check thefts and dacoities or remained inactive or did not take proper preventive action.[8]

---

1. Āin, I, p.283.
2. Bahār-i-Ajam, II, p.257.
3. Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, p.233; Akhbārāt, document No.2667, dated 19th Rabi II, 28th year 'Ālamgiri; Ibid., document No. 502, dated 6th Zīlqada, 23rd year Alamgiri; Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, ff. 53b-54a; Ovington, p.139; Finch, Early Travels, p.157; Thevenot, p.50; Akhbārāt, document No.2893, dated, 28th Shawwal, 29th year 'Ālamgiri.
4. Akhbārāt, document No.1695, dated 17th Ṣafar, 25th year of Aurangzeb.
5. Ibid.; Akhbārāt, dated 24th Shawwāl,33rd year of Aurangzeb;
6. Ibid., document No.2462, dated 4th Muharram, 28th year;Ibid., dated 19th Zīlhijja 44th year of Aurangzeb.
7. Akhbārāt, document No.2708, dated 18th Jumāda, I,28th year of Aurangzeb.
8. In a report from Mathura,it was stated that although Mabārij Khān, the faujdār of Mathura, already heard that trouble-makers and thieves had come to the city, he took no action and remained inactive. By the royal order his mansab was reduced by 700/200. For reference, see Akhbārāt, document No. 2462, dated 4th Muharram, 28th year of Aurangzeb.

The *faujdār* also had the obligation to defend the town in case of an assault or night attack by rebellious elements.[1] There are a large number of instances when *faujdārs* were promoted or rewarded by increase in *mansab* if they were able to fail such attempts.[2]

The *Mirāt* refers to the appointment of *faujdār-i gird* at *pargana ḥawīlī* Ahmadābād for the protection and administration of the suburbs and the adjoining areas.[3] He was appointed by the *Nāzim-i sūba* of Ahmadābād, and was paid Rs. 20,000 per annum.[4] His headquarters was in the redoubt of Mainpūr, outside the Astodiya gate.[5] He kept 500 horse as a regular force, half of which was utilized for patrol duty and the half stationed at the redoubt in the suburbs.[6] On the death or transfer of the *Nāzim*, he received an extra alloance of Rs. 5000 from the *dīwān-i sūba* and looked after the entire management and defence of the seventeen suburbs and eight villages of the *ḥawīlī*.[7]

1. See *Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan*, document No.3027, undated; *Akhbārāt*, document No.3016, dated 15th Rabī II, 31st year of Aurangzeb.
2. Kamāluddīn Khān, the faujdār of Hindaun-Biāna was promoted from 500/500 to 2000/1000 (1692) in reward for his having extirpated the rebels of that quarter. See *Ma'āsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, pp. 350-351.
3. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.169.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.169.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.169.

There were 32 *thānas* or posts equipped with horse and foot under his supervision.[1] We do not know whether the post of *faujdār-i-gird* also existed in other big cities, though we hear of the appointment of a similar *faujdār* in the neighbourhood of Agra.[2]

The court held by the *faujdār* was known as *kachehri-i-faujdāri*, where the complaints of the city people used to be heard.[3] There were three type of courts i.e. *kachehri-i-qazā*, *kachehri-i-ʿadālat* and *kachehri-i-faujdār* o *amīn*.[4] In towns where *subahdārs* did not hold their courts, the *kachehri-i-faujdār* used to be held.[5] The *faujdār* heard both the cases criminal (*faujdārī*) and revenue (*dīwānī*).[6] But in all his judgements he was not supposed to go against the rules of the *Shariʿat* and he had to be in constant consultation with *qāzī*, *muftī* and *mīr-ʿadl*.[7] Generally, while deciding the cases he had before him the judgements previously passed by the *qāzis* for using them as precedents.[8] There are also cases of the *faujdār* and

1. *Mirʾāt*, (Suppl.), p. 170.
2. *Pādshāhnāma*, II, p.610.
3. See *Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriqa* f. 63a.
4. While the Kachehri-i-ʿadālat (subahdārs court) was meant for the entire province, the courts of qāzī, faujdār and amīn exclusively were held for the city business. See *Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriqa*, f. 63ab.
5. *Ibid.*, ff. 65b, 66a.
6. *RF (1678-84)*, p.355; *Mutafarriq Mahārājgan*, Bundle 2, document 329, dated 19th Safar, 1117 A.H.
7. *Mirʾāt*, I, p.257.
8. See *Allāhābād Document* Nos. 370 and 1201.

the *qāzī* jointly holding the court. When the judgement was passed, it was the duty of the *faujdār* to enforce the rulings of the court.[1] However, our sources are silent about the actual jurisdiction of the *faujdār*'s court. An appeal against the decision of *faujdār* could be taken to the court of the *sūbahdār*.[2]

Another duty of the *faujdār* was to patrol the highways leading to and from the cities.[3] They were repeatedly instructed to see that the *banjāras* (grain carriers) and merchants were not robbed, nor illegal exactions charged from them, while they were on their way to supply grain and other commodities to the city. Failure in this led to transfers, and even dismissals, of *faujdārs*.[4] It was reported to the Court from Ahmadābād that Kārtalab Khān, the *faujdār* of *Hawīlī sarkār* Ahmadābād, was given to understand (by the *sūbahdār*) that because of inadequate supply, the corn was very dear in

---

1. *Ibid.*, No. 375.

2. *Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq*, f. 66b.

3. Manucci, II, pp. 422 & 434.

4. *Akhbārāt* document No.1677, dated 13th Zilhijja 6th year of Bahādur Shāh. It was reported from Shāhjahānābād that Kesho Rao Harkāra brought to the notice of the Emperor that Samī Khān, faujdar of Shāhjahānābād, was realizing duty on corn from banjāras, and so, the corn was being sold very dearer in the city. The Emperor thereupon ordered another man to be appointed faujdār in place of Samī Khān *Ibid.*, document No. 2321, dated 4th Safar, 27th year of Aurangzeb.

in the city. An order, therefore, was issued to all the faujdārs and the thānadārs to execute muchalkas (bonds) for the safe arrival of corn in the city.[1]

It was also the duty of the faujdār to see that his subordinate officials did not molest and oppress the people. Besides watching the work of amīn, mutasaddī, 'āmil, karorī, zamīndār, qānūngo and chaudharī on revenue side, he was also to supervise the duties of kotwāl, thānadār, rāhdār and local waqā'i navīs, sawānih-nigār and harkāra.[2] Failure in preventing oppressive conduct by lower officials is held out as justification for action against some faujdārs.[3] A newly appointed faujdār was instructed to "destroy the forts of lawless men and rebel chiefs; guard the roads protect the revenue payers;

---

1. Ibid., document No. 2522, dated 12th Safar 28th year Aurangzeb. Similarly in another report from Ahmadābād, it was mentioned that, "the food grain is very costly in Ahmadābād because the grain merchants are not bringing adequate supply for fear of tax (mahsūl)." Thereupon, the headquarters directed the Faujdār, Kārtalab Khān, to condone the tax on food grain for one complete year, Akhbārāt, document No. 2451, dated 27 Zīlqada 28th year of Aurangzeb.

2. See Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, ff. 122b, 123 a-b, 133 a-b & 260 ab.

3. Pādshāhnāma, II, p.426. The mansab of Amānullāh Khān, faujdār of Gwāliar, was reduced by 100 tr. for, he failed to check his subordinate from exacting rāhdārī, see Akhbārāt, document No.2189, dated 6th Safar 26th year of Aurangzeb. The faujdār of Jālna was dismissed at the complaint of residents of the qasba, Akhbārāt, dated 7th Zīlqada 44th year Aurangzeb. Muhammad Khalīl, faujdār of Narwar, was imprisoned for collecting rāhdārī, Akhbārāt, document No. 2708, dated 18th Jumāda 28th year. Kamāl Jālorī, faujdār of Palānpūr (sūba Gujarāt), was warned for exacting abwāb such as gāu-charāī and khurāk-i-aspān (fooder for horses), see Mirāt, I, p.276.

assist and give support to the agents of the jāgīrdārs and the karorīs at the time of collecting the revenue; .... forbid the blacksmiths to manufacture matchlocks; urge the thānadārs whom you appoint under yourself, to take complete possession of their charges, to abstain from dispossessing people from their rightful property and from levying any forbidden cesses." The faujdār is also advised to "conciliate the local waqāi-navīs, sawānih-nigār and harkāra in order that they may always write their reports of occurrences in a manner leading to your advancement."[1]

THE THĀNA & THE THĀNADĀR:

Thāna means an enclosed quarter or a fort where cavalry, infantry, musketeers and cross bow-men were posted for the preservation of order, so that the travellers and the residents might live peacefully undisturbed by evil-doers and robbers.[2] Thānas, therefore, were established everywhere in disturbed areas and around the cities.[3] The chief objects for

---

1. Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn, ff. 34-36. According to one Vakīl Report, Bundle No.8, document No.700 undated, the waqāi report before being sent to the court could be examined by the faujdār.

2. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.170; Waqāi-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 177-78; Ruq'at-i-Alamgiri, p.81.

3. Tuzuk, pp. 287-288; Pādshāhnāma, II, p.64; Mazhar-i-Shahjahani, p. 122; Nigarnama-i-Munshi, f. 129b.

establishing _thānas_, were to maintain law and order,[1] to check thefts and robbery[2] to protect roads, and to communicate news;[3] to supply food grains and other commodities for the royal army when on campaign;[4] to help the collection of revenue and to regulate the supply of essentials by providing protection to _banjāras_ and merchants. The head of the _thāna_ was called _thānadār_. He was appointed by the Emperor at the recommendation of _nāzim_ and _dīwān_.[5] But in the _jāgīrs_, the _jāgīrdārs_ had their own agents appointed as _thānadārs_.[6] The _thānadār_ was an immediate subordinate of the _faujdār_ and carried out his orders. His _mansab_ varied in accordance of the strategic situation of the place of appointment, personality of the appointee and the load of work. The establishment of _thānas_ around the city had great significance for the defence

---

1. For proper management and security purposes, the thānas around Ahmadābād were established at a distance of one or two karoh from each other. See _Mirāt_ (Suppl.) p. 172.

2. _Ibid._, I, p.314.

3. _Khāfī Khān_, II, p. 495.

4. Four thānas were established, between Burhānpūr and Qila' Parinda through which grain and other provisions for the encamping royal army used to be supplied. See _Pādshāhnāma_, II, p.35; _Ibid._, p. 505.

5. _Mirāt_ (Suppl.) p. 189.

6. _Vakil Report_, Bundle No.8, document No. 767, dated 2nd Ramzan, 33rd year of Aurangzeb; _Mutafarriq Mahārājgan_, Bundle No.3, document No. 484, dated 19th Rabī I, 1124 A.H.

of the city and the security of roads leading to and from the city. It was perhaps for this reason that around *hawīlī pargana* Ahmadābād there were 32 *thānas* which kept strict watch over whosoever entered the city or came out.[1] Said Khān, the *thānadār* of Peshāwar, is said to have successfully defended the town when it was attacked by evil-doers.[2] Not only this, the *thānas* around the city also helped to regulate the supply of food-grains and other essentials. According to the reports from Chittor and Ranthambhor, the *thānadārs* and the *chaudhurīs* were made to execute bonds to help, to regulate the supply of corn and other commodities in the *bāzārs*.[3]

Normally a *thānadār* was not very greatly concerned with the internal administration of the town; but at times he could act as an important local official if called upon to intervene in the town affairs in a given circumstances. There is an example of a *thānadār* of Seha[4] (*sūba* Mālwa) who for one complete year (1705-1706) acted in three capacities, *i.e.* *thānadār*, *kotwāl* and *faujdār* at one and the same time.

---

1. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.170.
2. *Pādshāhnāma*, I, pp. 313-314.
3. *Waqāi-i-Ajmer*, II, 540.
4. The town of Seha, *sarkār* Ujjain, *sūba* Mālwa, was held both in jāgīr and faujdārī by Mahārāja Swai Jai Singh II (1705-6). He had the right to appoint Kotwāl and thānadār. For reference see the sources cited below, P.104.

It so happened that 'Azmatullah Beg, the *Kotwāl* of the *pargana* and *qasba* Seha revolted and joined the rebels. The *thānadār* of the place, Udai Singh, arrested the *kotwāl* and sent him to the *sarkār* head-quarters at Ujjain and himself discharged all the duties of *kotwāl* in the town. He appointed men at *chabutra-i-kotwālī* to collect market dues,[1] directed his agents to make proper arrangements in the *qasba* as cases of theft had become common,[2] and organised searches for thieves;[3] divided the *mahsūl-i-hāt* collected at *Chabutra-i-kotwālī* into two parts, one fourth as share of government and the remainder distributed among *gumāshtas*.[4] Acting as *faujdār* he helped one Manohar Dālū from Ujjain in realizing his money which was due from the *zamīndārs* of most of the villages attached to the *pargana*;[5] imprisoned the *muqaddam* for illegally realizing custom from some merchants;[6] and also ordered the imprisonment of the *muqaddam* of village Pindi on the report of one Sayyid Mango that the above *muqaddam* had

---

1. *Akhbārāt*, document No.600, dated 13 & 14th Rabī I, 1116 A.H.
2. *Ibid.*, document No. 611, dated 4 & 5th Jumāda I, 1116 A.H.
3. *Ibid.*, document No.659, dated 23rd Rabī I, 1116 A.H.
4. *Akhbārāt*, document No.609, dated 1 & 2nd Jumāda I, 1116 A.H.
5. *Ibid.*, document No.624, dated 1-3 Jumāda II, 1116 A.H.
6. *Akhbārāt*, document No. 614, dated 10 & 12 Jumāda I, 1116 A.H.

not paid the *jiziya*;[1] compelled the refractory elements to return the money of the merchants,[2] and collected *peshkash* from all the villages of the *pargana*.[3]

The above information shows that the *faujdār*'s office, together with *thānas*, formed one of the most significant institution not only for the maintenance of law and order and of the safety of roads outside the town, but also for the defence of the town and for the regular supplies of essential commodities to the town. Without them, the economic life of the towns could come to a stand still.

THE QILA' AND THE QILA'DĀR:

Almost every large town had a *qila'* made of mud, bricks or red sand stone.[4] In an earlier chapter we have suggested that the main purposes for building forts throughout the Empire were to use them as places of refuge in hours of danger;

---

1. *Ibid.*, document No.606, dated 27th Rabī II, 1116 A.H.

2. *Ibid.*, document No.623, dated 29th Jumāda I, 1116 A.H.

3. *Ibid.*, document No.604, dated 25 Rabī I, 1116 A.H.

4. The references for large number of forts may be found in the *Āīn*, 'Account of Twelve Sūbas' I, pp. 385 to 594. According to Manucci, there were about 480 forts in the Mughal empire. One hundred in north from Kābul to Bengāl and three hundred and eighty in south including Bījāpūr, Golkunda and Karnatic, see Manucci, II, p.419. *Āīn* mentions about 129 forts, belonging to 5 sarkar of Orissa in suba Bengāl. *Āīn*, I, p.391. The list of forty-one forts, given in *Zawābit-i-Ālamgīrī*, for the whole Mughal empire is incomplete [redacted] It does not include the forts of Deccan. ff. 51b-52a. The Wilāyat of Qandāhar is said to have contained 60 forts. See *Pādshāhnāma*, II, pp. 61-62.

to serve as store-house for corn, treasures and heirless property; to be used as state prisons; and to headquarter *thānas* and above all to defend the town against the attack of trouble-creators. It was perhaps for this reason that the forts were made strongholds well-provided with all the means of defence. In medieval times, the fall of a fort was the fall of the city. The forts therefore were necessary for retaining the hold of the country especially in riotous areas. The *naqqāra* and *garyāl* used to be beaten at the gate to proclaim the subjugation of the area.[1]

The commandant of the fort was known as *qil'adār*. He was appointed directly from the Imperial headquarters.[2] He was independent of the governor, the *faujdār* or the *mutasaddī* (in case of Sūrat).[3] The command of the fortress was usually held of the Emperor, and was separate from, and independent of, the authority controlling the adjoining town, or area. The reason for this was the great importance given to holding the forts well-supplied and in military readiness, by a garrison and commander directly loyal to the Emperor. They were used as store houses and arsenals, and it was important not to give authority over them to the other officials. Whenever the

---

1. *Mirāt* (Suppl.) p. 185.
2. Irvine, *The Army*, p. 269; Ovington, pp. 130-131.
3. Hamilton, p, 321; Thomas Best, p.28.

Emperor left the capital, separate men were often appointed to hold the posts of qil'adār, faujdār (hawili-i-sarkar), Kotwāl[1] and so on.

The qil'adār usually had under his command a sizeable garrison consisting of cavalry, infantry, musketeers, rocketeers, cannoniers, labourers and porters.[2] He ranked among the high officials and his mansab varied in accordance with the importance of the fort.

In the administration of the town the qil'adār was thus not directly in the picture. However, when the faujdār or the mutasaddi or whosoever had been supreme in the city was not in the city or under orders of transfer, the qil'adār was asked to officiate in his stead and looked after the entire general administration of the town.[3] There are also references to the qil'adār simultaneously holding the office

---

1. In the 11th year, when Shāhjahān left Āgra to Lāhore following officers were appointed at Āgra: Saif Khān qil'adār, Agha Khan faujdar (hawili Āgra); Sharifuddin Kotwāl. See Pādshāhnāma, II, p.110. For similar arrangement on another occasion, see Ibid., pp. 407-408.

2. See Chapter I, p.19. At Qandahar fort there were about 7000 beldārs, 6000 stone-cutter, large number of water carriers and porters. See Akhbārāt, document No. 2798, dated 4th Rajab, 28th year. For piyādas, beldārs, barqandāz, saqqa and porters at qila' Kothala, see Ibid., document No. 2438, dated 17th Ziqa'da, 28th year.

3. EF (1618-21), pp. 208,101,145.

of *sūbahdār*, *faujdār*, *Kotwāl* or *thānadār*.[1] But such arrangements were usually temporary, made in order to deal with a particular situation. Officially the main duties assigned to the *qilʿadār* were : to keep his contingent in a state of readiness and well-equipped;[2] to strengthen the fort and hold provisions in store sufficient for long period;[3] to keep close watch over the lawless elements;[4] to look after the prisoners;[5] to guard the treasures kept therein;[6] and finally to communicate the available local news directly to the imperial headquarters.[7] According to one *dastūr-al-ʿamal*, the *qilʿadār* was also required to post his news reporters in various streets and *bāzārs* of the city in order to acquaint himself with the latest information.[8]

---

1. For sūbahdārī and qilʿadārī held by one man, *Iqbālnāma*, p.192; *Pādshāhnāma*, I, p.369; *Maʾāsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī*, p.132. For faujdārī and qilʿadārī, see *Tūzuk*, p.270; *ʿĀlamgīrnāma*, p.218, 162. For qilʿadārī and Kotwālī, see ※ below. For qilʿadārī and thānadārī, see *Pādshāhnāma*, II, p.301.
2. *Dastūr-i-Jahān Kushāī*, ff. 54b, 55a; *Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī*, pp. 232-33.
3. *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī*, f. 205 ab.
4. *Ibid.*; *Dastūr-i-Jahān Kushāī*, ff. 54b-55a; *Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī*, pp. 232-233; *Mirāt*, I, p.213; *Pādshāhnāma* II, pp. 650-657.
5. *Maʾāsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī*, p. 406; ~~xxqxt~~
6. Hawkins, *Early Travel*, p.100; *Waqāʾi-i-Ajmer*, I, p.101; *Ibid.*, II, pp. 480-81; *Akhbārāt*, dated 3rd Safar, 33rd year of Aurangzeb.
7. *Dastūr-i-Jahān Kushāī*, ff. 54b-55a.
8. *Ibid.*

※ *Akhbārāt*, document No. 2549, dated 12th Rabī I, 39th year Aurangzeb.

__MUHTASIB:__

The officer appointed to guard public morals was known as _muhtasib_ [1]. There are stray references to the office of the _muhtasib_ before Aurangzeb's time, [2] but his actual duties are not specified. The cencorship of public morals and supervision of markets were then exercised by the _qāzī_ and the _kotwāl_. [3] In 1669 however, the office of _muhtasib_ was created on a systematic basis with the object of enforcing conformity with the _sharīʿat_. [4] The _muhtasibs_ were now appointed in cities and towns through the royal _sanads_ and at the recommendation of the _sadr_. [5] According to the _Mirʾāt_, the _zāt_ rank of the _muhtasib_ of Ahmadābād was 250 and he also had ten _suwārs_ at his disposal. [6] The _Nāzims_ of the provinces through a royal order were given strict instructions to provide further military assistance to the _muhtasib_, whenever he so required. [7] The _muhtasibs_ were paid

---

1. Literally the word _muhtasib_ means "one who keeps an account." But in popular connotation it is known to have been associated with the office which was to enforce the _Sharīʿat_ and the censor of public morals and to oversee the markets. Under the Abbasides the _muhtasibs_ were appointed to supervise markets and public morals. According to Barnī, he was in charge of prosecutions under the cannon law. In India the first appointment of such an officer was made in the reign of Iltutmish, See Barnī, p.441.
2. See _Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī_, p.190; _Sharāʾif Ushmānī_, f.144a, for a farman of Akbar issued to Qāzī ʿAbdul Samad, _muhtasib_, of Bilgrām.
3. See Chapter IV, p.128 for Qāzī, and Chapter II, pp 59, 60, 61 for Kotwāl.
4. _Maʾāsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī_, p.156.
5. Sarkar, _History of Aurangzeb_, III, pp. 81-82; _Mirʾāt_ (Suppl.), p.174; _Sivānāma_, p.89; _Waqāʾi-i-Ajmer_, I, p.20, _Ibid._, p. 239; _Mirʾāt_, I, pp. 249-50.

Contd.....

both in cash and land grants varying from place to place.[1]

From the records of the period, it appears that the *muhtasib* had to perform two type of duties - religious and secular. The order of appointment of a *muhtasib* enjoined him thus: "To those Muslims who do not know the rules of worship according to the True Faith and Islamic conduct or ceremonies, you should give instructions in these matters. If they plead inability, reprimand or chastise them ... give good counsel and warning to those who violate the *Quranic* precepts."[2] He was also to prohibit the use, sale and purchase of intoxicating drinks, and forbid prostitutes from residing in cities.[3] The dealers in wine and bhang were to be forced to execute bonds not to indulge in production and sale of intoxicants.[4] The *muhtasib* was also entrusted with the destruction of temples and their conversion into mosques, and

---

(Continued from the previous page)

6. *Mirāt* (Suppl.) p.174.
7. Sarkar, *History of Aurangzeb*, op.cit.

1. *Mirāt* (Suppl.) p.174; *Waqāi-i-Ajmer*, I, p.20; *Mirāt*, I, p. 291.
2. *Hidāyat-al-Qawānin*, ff. 21-22; *Siyāqnāma*, p.89; *Mirāt*, (Suppl.) pp. 80-81.
3. *Hidāyat-al-Qawānin*, f.21; *Siyāqnāma*, p.89; Khāfī Khān, II, p.80; *'Alamgirnāma*, I, pp.391-92; *Mirāt*, I, pp.249-50.
4. *Waqāi-i-Ajmer*, I, p.183.

prevention of the building new temples.[1] He had to exercise the functions of the *mutawallī* of mosques in the towns.[2] He was required to report to the Emperor about the conditions and requirements of mosques.[3]

The secular duties of the *Muhtasib* were: to enforce the standard weights and measures in the market; to prohibit the circulation of counterfeit coins and coins deficient in weight and to get the under-weight coins replaced by genuine ones;[4] to collect information about the rates and weights in use in the shops of butchers, grain-dealers and other shop-keepers and to get the schedule of rates settled at the *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī*;[5] to issue orders to traders to show him the commodities brought from outside to the city for sale and to report to him the actual quantity of commodities which they had bought and sold.[6] According to the *Siyāsnāma*, the *muhtasib*

---

1. See Khāfī Khān, II, pp. 358-59, for the appointment of muhtasib at Haidarābād and orders given to him for the destruction of temples and their conversion into mosques and forbidding the non-Muslim to practise rites and rituals.

2. *Waqāi'-i-Ajmer*, I, p.18.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 215.

4. *Ibid.*, I, p.199.

5. *Ibid.*, p.345.

6. *Ibid.*

also held the post of *nirkh-navis*. In that capacity he was required to prepare a schedule of rates after ascertaining the prices every day and hand over the list of prices to the officers concerned after affixing his own seal.[1]

In addition to the above duties, the *muhtasib* had certain municipal functions to discharge. The *Hidāyat-al-Qavānin* states that he was vested with powers to see that "if any one, contrary to the regulation and custom, has screened off a part of the street, or closed the path, or thrown dirt and sweepings on the road ... or if any one has seized the portion of the *bāzār* area reserved for public traffic and opened his shop there, the *Muhtasib* should in such cases compel them to remove the violation of regulations."[2]

Under Aurangzeb the *muhtasib* was a very influential official in town administration; but his authority was limited by that of the *Kotwāl*.[3] He could not imprison, detain or coerce anyone without the permission of the *faujdār*.[4] The *muhtasib* of Jodhpūr once took into detention a *Jogī* accusing

---

1. *Sivāgnāma*, p. 89.
2. *Hidāyat-al-Qavānin*, ff. 21-22.
3. *Waqāi-i-Ajmer*, I, pp. 206-7.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 183.

the latter of being the leader of infidels and doing forbidden things; though, in fact, the object of imprisoning him was known to be to extort money from him and other Hindus. This was done against the advice of the _faujdār_ who took it as an affront to himself; and he, thereafter, warned the _muhtasib_ not to do what was outside his competence.[1]

Even in cases of traders using deficient weights and measures he was not authorised to pass judgements.[2] The judicial powers of the _muhtasib_ were very few. With the small number of force under him he performed the functions of police enforcing the _shari'at_; regulating the market rules and probably holding summary trials of the violations of regulations laid down by the _Shari'at_. The formal procedure was this: on being informed of the offences he was to report the case to the _qāzī_, who summoning the witnesses decided the cases and communicated the judgements to the _Kotwāl_ who enforced or carried out the judgement or sentence.[3]

---

1. _Ibid._, pp. 189-90.

2. _Waqā'i-i-Ajmer_, I, pp. 223-4.

3. _Ibid._, pp. 189-90, 212-13.

INTELLIGENCE:

The agencies through which the central government obtained news of the whole empire were: (1) the waqā'i-navis (ii) sawānih-nigār, (iii) khufia-navis and (iv) harkārah.[1] The first three used to send written reports while the last, literally, a courier, generally brought oral news, but at times written ones.[2] The waqā'i were sent once a week,[3] sawānih twice[4] and the akhbār of harkārah once a month.[5] However, urgent matters were to be reported immediately. The waqā'i-navis was more regular and a public reporter;[6] sawānih nigār a little irregular and reported secretly;[7] while the khufia navis

---

1. The waqā'i navis, sawānih-nigārs and harkārahs collectively called akhbār-navis were employed to apprise the central government of the state of public affairs, the conduct of government officials, social and economic conditions and the details of the working of the complex administrative machinery. See Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 13,17,22,36,56, 178,181,183,186, Ibid., II, pp. 509,513. The waqā'i-navis and harkārahs were already there but the institution of sawānih nigār appears to have been introduced during the reign of Shāhjahān. See Mirāt, I, p.204; Ruqāt-i-Ālamgiri, p.6.

2. Sarkar, Mughal Administration, p.61.

3. Mirāt (Suppl.) p.176; Hidāyat-al-Qawānin, ff. 22-23;

4. Ibid.

5. Hidāyat-al-Qawānin, f. 23.

6. Mirāt (Suppl.) ,p.176.

7. Ibid.

and harkāra also conveyed secret news.[1] The waqāi-navis was appointed by the order of the Emperor through a royal sanad sometimes bearing the seal of the wazir.[2] The sawānih-nigār was appointed through the instrumentality of Imperial Dārogha-i-Dāk.[3] The harkāras were appointed by the chief superintendent of harkāras (Dārogha-i-harkārahāi kull).[4]"

These intelligence officers and their agents were posted throughout the empire, at the Imperial capital, head-quarters of the provinces, sarkārs, and parganas, ports, forts, army camps, courts of princes, mansions of nobles, various courts of justice, the Chabutra-i-Kotwālī and market places.[5]

A study of the Akhbārāt-i-darbār-i-Muallā, the Waqāi-i-Ajmer-o-Ranthambhor and the Waqāi-i-Deccan reveals that the intelligence services supplied information relating

---

1. Ibid., Sarkar, Mughal Administration, p.61.
2. Mirāt (Suppl.) p.173; Nigārnama-i-Munshi, p.140.
3. Mirāt (Suppl.) p.175.
4. Ibid., p. 177.
5. Mirāt, I, p.212; Maāsir-i-Ālamgiri, pp. 64-65, 69; Nigārnama-i-Munshi, pp. 87,88, 140-41; Selected Waqāi, pp. 63-80, 59-60; Sivāgnāma, pp. 91-92; Maāsir-i-i-Ālamgiri, pp. 33-34; Mirāt, I, pp. 226-234; Nigārnama-i-Munshi, p. 178; Ruqāt-i-Ālamgiri, p.17; Mirāt (Suppl.) pp. 174-75.

to general as well as fiscal administration, all matters concerning agriculture, revenue assessment, collection and revenue arrears,[1] gifts and Peshkash,[2] accounts of the daily collection of money in the treasurer's office,[3] money remitted to Imperial treasury,[4] taxes and cesses,[5] income and expenditure under various heads,[6] market rates of various commodities, gold and silver, exchange-rates of coins,[7] legal proceedings at various courts and judgements passed in civil, criminal and revenue cases,[8] reports on thefts and robbery,[9] incidents of misuse of authority by town officials,[10] executions of bonds of contract, surety and indemnity,[11] appointments, promotions,

---

1. Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, pp. 87-89.
2. Selected Waqāi', pp. 6,12,15-16 & 17.
3. Siyāq-nāma, pp. 91-92.
4. Selected Waqāi', pp. 10,64,65,69,70.
5. Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, pp. 87-89; Selected Waqāi', p.54.
6. Ibid., pp. 32-45, 63-64, 75-77.
7. Ibid.
8. Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 4,18-19, 21-22, 23-24, 25, 29,35, 37-38, 59-60, 67-68, 172-185.
9. Akhbārāt, document No. 1146, dated 11th Safar 24th year 'Alamgīrī; Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, II, p.497.
10. Akhbārāt, document No. 1699, 9th Muharram, 6th year of Aurangzeb; Selected Waqāi', p.125; Akhbārāt, document No. 3810, dated 20th Rajab, 28th year of ~~Alamg~~ Aurangzeb; Ibid., dated 24th Rabī I, 49th year; Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, p.183.
11. Selected Waqāi', p. 11.

demotions and transfer of various officials,[1] the condition of crafts, industry and trade,[2] organisation and administration of markets,[3] and port administration, as well as curious matters.[4] Besides apprising the Imperial government with the actual news, the news-reporters were regarded as an effective check over abuse of authority, collection of illegal taxes, oppression and high-handedness by town officials. In a discourse with the English Factors the mutasaddi of Sūrat showed his fear of the waqāʼinavīs who could report to the Emperor against him.[5] Special harkāras used to be deputed to investigate the complaints made against local officials; and if the charges were proved the officers in question were liable to punishment.[6] The faujdār of Gwālior, for example, who used to extort rāhdārī and other abwāb, was punished by reduction in mansab on the basis of the waqāʼiʻ received from Gwālior.[7]

---

1. Ibid., pp. 47-49.
2. Ibid., p.46; Nigārnama-i-Munshi, pp. 88-89.
3. Akhbārāt, document No. 2451 dated 27th Ziliqada, 28th year Aurangzeb.
4. The Waqāʼiʻ Sūrat refers about the appointment of mutasaddīs at Sūrat and Cambay, see Akhbārāt, dated 14th safar 26th year of Aurangzeb. The Mutasaddī purchased two lākh maunds of grain. See Ibid., document No. 2079, dated 25th Ziliqada 26th year. See also Ibid document No. 2543, dated 25th Safar, 28th year. For Surat mint, see Ibid., document No. 2361 dated 24th Shaban 27th year of Aurangzeb.
5. EF (New Series), Vol. III, p.310.
6. Vakīl Report, Bundle No. document No. 996, dated 6th Ramzan 39th year Alamgiri.
7. Akhbārāt, document No. 2189, datdd 6th Safar 26th year of Aurangzeb.

Similarly the *faujdār* and the *qilādār* of Burhānpūr were punished with reduction in their *mansabs* because the *waqāi'* repeatedly reported their negligence to duty.[1] The *waqāi'* from Mathura reported that Rāja Bishan Singh, the *faujdār* of Mathura, patronised dancing girls and was negligent in the performance of duties. His *mansab* was accordingly reduced by 1000/-1000 *duaspa*.[2] The appointment of Tāj Chaman, the *kotwāl* of Kābul, was set aside for the *waqāi'* from Kabul reported that the people did not want him.[3] The *mansab* of Ihtishām Khān, the *Kotwāl* of Mathura, was reduced by 600/200 at the report of *waqāi'* that the above *kotwāl* was a drunkard and therefore negligent to duty.[4] The *qāzī* of Mathura started realizing 4½ *takas* as daily allowance from the residents of the city. The *waqāi'* brought this to the notice of the Emperor. Thereupon, a few *harkārahs* were sent to Mathura to enquire into the matter. But the courtiers reported that the charges against the *qāzī* were baseless; and he was quite innocent.[5]

The above evidence and other facts of similar nature show that the institution of news reports was essential for

---

1. *Akhbārāt*, document No. 3737 dated 25th Zilqa'da of Aurangzeb 51th year.
2. Ibid., document No.3130, dated Zilqa'da, 34th year of Aurangzeb.
3. *Akhbārāt*, document No.2932, dated and Zilhijja 29th year of Aurangzeb; *Ibid.*, document No. 2962.
4. Ibid., document No. 1582; dated 29th Zilhijja 25th year of Aurangzeb.
5. Ibid., document No. 3314, dated 28 Jumāda II, 38th year of Aurangzeb.

the smooth running of administration. Without it, the central government would have been left in total darkness about what was happening in the distant cities and towns. It was, for example, brought to the notice of the Imperial government only by the sawānih-nigār from Jodhpur that the Kotwāl there used to exact money on account of prohibited cesses such as the realization of Rs.3 monthly from shoe-makers for which no record was kept. Later on the practice was prohibited.[1] The Qāzī of Merta started collecting Jizya (poll-tax) from non-Muslims in his own name and kept it with him without letting it known to anybody, when the waqāi' reported it to authorities only then the matter was settled.[2]

However, there are also a large number of references when the waqāi', the sawānih and the harkāra were bribed by the local officials to send or to refrain from sending the actual news. In a Vakīl Report Auāi Rāi informed Rāja Bishan Singh that Muhd. Hussain waqāi'-navis posted at Jāwar, had not sent any report as yet regarding Rs.13,000, which the Rāja had realized from Manohata, the zamīndār of Jāwar, on account of the cost of corn which was taken out of the fort of Jāwar and sold to the above zamīndār. The Vakīl requested the Rāja to bribe the waqāi'navis so that he might send a favourable report of the matter.[3]

1. Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, p.206.
2. Ibid., II, pp. 508-509.
3. Vakīl Report, Bundle No.9, document No. 1035, dated 1106 A.H.; See Ibid., Bundle No.9, document No. 996, dated 6th Ramzan, 39th year. According to this document, Megh Rāj (the Vakīl of Rāja Bishan Singh) requested the Rāja to bribe the courier so that he might report in his favour.

CHAPTER IV

JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE TOWNS

Another important administrative institution of the town was the department of justice (*dārul-qazā*). While the duty of the *Kotwāl* and the *muhtasib* was to detect and apprehend offenders, the *qāzī* was to investigate the offence with the help of the witnesses, apply the law and pronounce the judgement either against a guilty person to be punished or in favour of an innocent to be released. Thus, almost every town provided it had a large Muslim population, had a *qāzī*.[1] *Qāzīs* were appointed even in towns under autonomous chiefs.[2] The villages did not have their own *qāzī*, but were placed under the jurisdiction of the *qāzī* of a neighbouring town or *pargana* headquarters to whose court they carried their suits.

---

1. For the appointment of the *qāzīs* at sarkār, pargana, towns, forts, see, *Mirāt*, (Suppl.), pp.199, 211, 222, 223; Khāfī Khān, II, p.630 (in case of sarkār); *Mirāt* (Suppl.) pp.193, 233; *Siyāqnāma*, pp. 86, 87; *Selected Documents*, pp. 189-190 (for *pargana*); *Waqāi-i-Ajmer*, I, pp.45-46, 35-36, 177; Khāfī Khān, II, pp. 234-235. For the appointment of qāzī at forts, The *Selected Documents*, pp. 189-190. According to the *Waqāi-i-Ajmer*, it was brought to the notice of the government that, qasba Bahanur (sūba Ajmer) contained 3,000 houses of Muslims and there was nobody to educate them in matters of namāz, Islamic conduct and the rules of Sharīat. Therefore, a qāzī should be appointed there. The request was granted. See *Waqāi-i-Ajmer*, II, p.539.

2. For the appointment of qāzī at Amber (or Āmer the watan of Kachhwāha family), see *Vakīl Report*, Bundle No. I, document No. 199, dated Muharram 1103 A.H.; *Ibid.*, bundle No.8, document, 199, dated 7th Muharram 36th year of Aurangzeb; *Ibid.*, Bundle No.7, document No.514, dated 29th Zilhijja 1102 A.H.; see also *Waqāi-i-Ajmer*, for Nāgor, Jodhpūr Jaisalmir, I, pp.45, 177, 193, 190; *Mirāt*, (Suppl.), p.233; *Akhbārāt*, document No.2957, dated 18th Zilqada 29th year.

The judicial administration comprehended not the *qāzī* alone, but along with him several other officials such as *muftī*, *mīr-i'adl*, *dārogha-i-Kachehrī qāzī*, *Vakīl-i-Shar'ī* (or *Vakīl-i-Sarkār*), and minor office-bearers such as *peshkār*, *sakkāk*, *sāhibul majlis*, *mushrif*, *amīn*, *nāzir*, *daftarī*, *mīrdaha*, *muchalka navīs* (or *munāsakha navīs*) combined to make it a full court of justice (*Kachehrī* or *'adālat khāna*) in every town.

QĀZĪ:

The chief *qāzī* was appointed by the Emperor,[1] while the provincial *qāzī* and the *qāzīs* posted in towns all over the Empire were to be appointed by the royal *sanad* bearing the seal of the *sadr-us-sudūr*.[2] Generally, the *qāzīs* were supposed to be men of learning and scholarship. A man due to be appointed to this office was required to be an adult male, intelligent, free man, a Muslim, a virtuous person (*ādil*), sound in sight and hearing and one who had perfect knowledge of the Law.[3] If the above conditions were fulfilled,

---

1. *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, p. 239; *Fatāwā-i-Ālamgīrī*, III, p.387.
2. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.174.
3. *Waqiāt-i-Ālamgīrī*, p.40; Badāonī, I, p.187; *Hidāyah*, XX, p. 338; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, II, p.606; Barnī, p.298; *Tazkira-i-Ulamā-i-Hind*, p.54.

in most cases, a son could succeed his father.[1]

Some qāzīs, especially of big towns, might hold mansabs. A qāzī, besides his personal mansab (zāt), had some troopers also. The qāzī of Ahmadābād, for example, had 20 suwār,[2] the qāzī of Āgra 60[3] while the qāzī of Jodhpūr had 10 ahadī and 20 gunners at his disposal.[4] The qāzī used to be paid daily allowances[5] and always had a revenue grant (madad-i ma'āsh)[6] attached to his office. In many cases, the above grant could exceed 100 bighas of cultivable land.[7]

---

1. Vakil Report, Bundle No.3, document No. 345; dated 16th Zilhijja, 1103 A.H. After the death of Muhammad Shād, the qazi of Amer, a long dispute ensued between Muhd. Mah (the son of the late qāzi) and one qāzi Azmatullah. Ultimately the former (Muhd.Mah) won both legally and morally and was appointed in place of his father. While the latter, who went to the extent that he produced a a forged sanad of appointment, was arrested and sent to the headquarters. See Ibid., Bundle No.I, document No.199, dated Muharram 1103 A.H.; Ibid., bundle No.8, document 199, dated 7th Muharram 35th year of Aurangzeb; Ibid., Bundle No.7, document 514, undated.

2. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.174.

3. Akhbārāt, document No.2668, dated 20th Rabī II, 28th year of Aurangzeb.

4. Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, p.177. For the mansab of qāzī, see also 'Amal-i-Salih, I, p.507; Ālamgirnāma, I, pp.48, 53.

5. Selected Documents (Aurangzeb), pp. 15-16; Khutūt Ahl kārān, document No. 1163 undated.

6. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.174; Nigārnāma-i-Munshī, p.122; Selected Document, (Shāhjahān), pp. 189-190; Ibid., (Aurangzeb) p.15; Siyāqnāma, pp. 86-87; K.K. Datta, pp. 15-16, document No.104, Persian (4) University Collection, dated 11th Shabān 1075 A.H.

7. Siyāqnāma, pp. 86-87.

Sometimes, it was a life-tenure but mostly of the nature of a perpetual grant subject to the right of the crown to revoke, reduce, or increase it.[1]

The qāzī's post was transferable.[2] On being appointed, his name was announced throughout the city so that, all, high and low, might know and pay him their respects.[3] He could be dismissed on charges of abuse of authority, corruption, partiality while giving judgement and the displeasure of the emperor;[4] or he could resign of his own will.[5]

Sometimes the qāzī held more than one post. In one case a man occupied the offices of both the qāzī and the sadr;[6] in another case of qāzī and dīwān.[7] In a third case, the posts of qāzī, sadr and amīn were combined together and given to one man.[8] At Kābul the qāzī also held the posts of dārogha and amīn of the treasury.[9]

1. Ibid.
2. Maāsir-i-Ālamgiri, p.240.
3. Khāfi Khān, II, p.255; Allāhābād Document, 11106.
4. Badāoni, III, p.78; Maāsir-i-Ālamgiri, p.224; Mirāt, I, p.248.
5. Khāfi Khān, II, p.343.
6. Ālamgirnāma, I, p.1035.
7. Khāfi Khān, II, p.138.
8. Akbarnāma, III, p.601.
9. Akhbārāt, document No. 2441, dated 20th Ziiqada, 28th year of Aurangzeb.

JURISDICTION:

The jurisdiction of the qāzī was wide enough. But while deciding civil, criminal and religious cases he could not deviate from the expressed commands and injunctions of the shariʿat. Otherwise, he enjoyed considerable discretion in so far as decision on the facts was concerned.

CIVIL CASES:

The civil jurisdiction of the qāzī included cases in respect of inheritance,[1] marriage, divorce,[2] marriage with non-Muslims,[3] disposal of stolen property,[4] emoluments of servants of mosques[5] and other disputes on property.[6]

He was the custodian of unclaimed property found on roads,[7] valuables left by strangers[8] and property confiscated from the house of criminals, such as those killed in an encounter with the Kotwāl,[9] and had the responsibility for

1. Waqāʾiʿ-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 24-25.
2. Selected Waqāʾiʿ, p. 95.
3. Mirʾāt, I, p.282.
4. Ibid., pp. 279-280.
5. Waqāʾiʿ-i-Ajmer, I, p.184.
6. Ibid., p. 35.
7. Mirʾāt, I, p.169.
8. Ibid.
9. Waqāʾiʿ-i-Ajmer, I, p.67.

the return of such property to the genuine owner, if any. He also fixed claims and distributed the inherited estates and legacies, investigated concealed property and the property of the orphans.[1]

He was also vested with the duties of modern registrars for recording title-deeds, contracts, and sale-deeds and took surety-bonds and bail-bonds[2] and accepted _muchalkas_ (written statements)[3] and kept their records. He also compared copies with the originals of documents, and attested them by seal and endorsement.[4]

He issued identity certificates and verified the medical certificates and leave applications submitted by local officials.[5]

---

1. _Nigārnāma-i-Munshī_, p.122; _Allāhābād Document_, 1268. According to this document, which is a _mahzar_, a judgement was given by a bench of three qāzis in a dispute over the ownership of a village Mustafābād, sarkār Bahrāich (Sūba Awadh), after the death of one Syed Muhammad. There were three claiments one daughter and two sons. The qāzī decided in favour of the daughter named Lazzati. See also Ibid., 1880, Ibid., 12276; Ibid., 503; Ibid. 519.
2. _Nigārnāma-i-Munshī_, op.cit.; _Selected Documents_ (Shāhjahān) p.162; _Hidāyat-al-Qavānīn_, f.20; _Allāhābād Document_ 12116, for mutual exchange of land.
3. _Vakīl Report_, Bundle No. 4, document No.476, dated 3rd Rabī, 1105 A.H.
4. Ibid., Bundle No.2, Document No.230, dated 6th Zīlhijja 1101 A.H.; _Akhbārāt_, document, 669, dated 4th Jumāda I, 1116 A.H.; _EF (1661-64)_, p.289; _Waqā'i-i-Ajmer_, I, p.193; _Selected Documents_ (Shāhjahān), p.162; Johan Van Twist, p.69.
5. _EF (1655-60)_, p.134.

MERCANTILE CASES:

The mercantile jurisdiction of the qāzī comprised the suits filed by the merchants against other merchants,[1] officials[2] and artisans[3] or vica versa; complaints of non-payment of debt and interest thereon;[4] cases relating to the custom house (farza);[5] disputes over the arrangements of shops in the market;[6] dissolutions of bargains;[7] cases relating to counterfeit coins and their circulation,[8] trade agreements[9] etc.

The qāzī and the muftī were kept informed about the hāl-i-hasil in the city or at market place.[10] In determining

1. For the cases Merchant vers. merchant, see EF (1637-41), pp. 106-107; Akhbārāt, document No. 3293; dated 8th Shawwāl 38th year of Aurangzeb.

2. Merchant vers. Faujdār and Ṣūbahdār, see Akhbārāt document No.3302, dated, 23rd Zilqada 38th year of Aurangzeb.

3. Merchant vers. weavers at Ahmadābād, see EF (1622-23), p.40.

4. Vakīl Report, Bundle No.4, document 476, dated 3rd Rabī, 1105 A.H.

5. Ovington, pp. 136-137.

6. Akhbārāt, document No.3293, dated 8th Shawwāl 38th year of Ālamgīr.

7. EF (1618-21), pp. 269,273.

8. Mirāt, I, pp. 279-280.

9. EF (1622-23), p. 320.

10. Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī, p.103.

the prices of grain and other commodities too, the _qāzī_ was consulted;[1] and the schedule of market rates, before being made public or submitted to the government, required his seal and signature.[2]

RELIGIOUS DUTIES:

The religious duties of the _qāzī_ were many. They included the enforcement of the rules and injunctions of the _Sharī'at_ - to exhort Muslims to offer the five daily prayers, and the _'Īd_ and Friday prayers,[3] maintain the "Islamic mode of conduct",[4] observe of the fast in the month of _Ramzān_ and pay the _zakāt_.[5] During the reign of Aurangzeb, another new duty associated with the office of _qāzī_ was the destruction of temples, converting them into mosques and forbidding the building of new-ones.[6] The local _qāzī_'s used to submit reports

---

1. _Dastūr_, B.M.Add.6599, f.41b; _Selected Waqāi'_, pp. 93-94, 130.

2. _Allāhābād Document_, 10708; _Selected Waqāi'_, pp. 93-94,130.

3. _Nigārnāma-i-Munshī_, p.122; _Siyāqnāma_, p.86; _Selected Documents_ (Aurangzeb) pp. 15-16; _Waqāi'-i-Ajmer_, I, p.183; Ibid., II, 639; _Iqbālnāma-i-Jahāngīrī_, pp. 188-189.

4. _Waqāi'-i-Ajmer_, II, p.639.

5. _Mirāt_ (Suppl.) p.69; _Waqāi'-i-Ajmer_, I, p.161.

6. _Ibid._, I, pp. 192-93, 197.

of the demolished temples.[1] At the qāzī's suggestion the property of temples and dharamshālās would be confiscated and deposited into Baitul māl.[2] These were also the duties of the muhtasib; but in the towns which did not have muhtasib these duties appear to have been discharged by the qāzīs.

The other religious duties of the qāzī were reading the khūtba,[3] leading the ʿĪd and Friday prayers, announcing the visibility of the new-moon,[4] punishing the heretics and sinners,[5] conversion of non-Muslims and performing the marriages of Hindu women who had embraced Islam.[6]

Further more, the qāzī was also assigned the task of collecting jiziya;[7] and those who sought an exemption from payment thereof had to produce a sanad from him.[8]

CRIMINAL CASES:

It is wrong to suggest that the qāzī's jurisdiction was limited to civil and religious cases alone; and he had

---

1. Ibid., pp. 181-197.
2. Ibid., pp. 184, 192-193.
3. Selected Waqāi', p.127; Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, II, p.539.
4. Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 55-56.
5. Mirāt, I, pp.282-283; Khāfī Khān, II, p.555.
6. Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, p.178.
7. Ibid., p. 509.
8. Vakil Report, Bundle No.I, document No.165, dated 8th Muharram, 1106 A.H.; Mirāt, I, pp.339, 295-299; Khāfī Khān, II, p.606.

no authority over criminal cases which were decided by the governor, the _faujdār_ and the _Kotwāl_. But contrary to this, there are large number of references of criminal cases such as murder, theft, robbery, attempted murder, _etc._, tried by the _qāzī_.[1]

The _qāzī_ also performed the duty of holding an inquiry in case of complaints originally submitted to the governor or the _faujdār_ but referred by them to him.[2] Generally, the practice followed by the governors was that they heard suits, and appeals against the _qāzīs'_ decisions, decided a few of them, while they made over the rest to the _qāzī_ of the headquarters for investigation whereafter they passed judgements based on the findings of the _qāzī_ and embodying his recommendations.[3] The criminal jurisdiction of the _qāzī_ also included such cases as offences of adultery,[4] fornication,[5] inhuman

---

1. For criminal cases heard, tried and adjudicated by the qāzī, see _Ma'āsir-i-'Ālamgīrī_, p.126; Khāfī Khān, II, pp. 257-258; _Ibid._, p.156; _Waqāi'-i-Ajmer_, I, p.4; _Ibid._, pp. 18-19; _Ibid._, pp. 28,68; _Mir'āt_, I, pp. 278-79.

2. _Waqāi'-i-Ajmer_, I, p.21.

3. _Ibid._, p.38; _Selected Waqāi'_, pp. 83,96.

4. _Mir'āt_, I, p.282.

5. _Ibid._

practices,[1] taking of liquor and other intoxicants,[2] a slave's escape from his master's house,[3] the castrating of boys,etc.[4]

OTHER DUTIES:

In addition to his judicial duties discussed above the qazi had to perform several other functions:

1. He was the official visitor of the prison where he had powers to make an on-the-spot inquiry into the cases of prisoners; and if he felt necessary, he could release undertrial prisoners on bail.[5]

2. He solemnized the marriages of Muslims in the town.[6]

3. The public mosques in the town were under his control.[7]

4. He along with the Sadr distributed the money collected in Baitul mal on charitable purposes and among the poor.[8]

5. On being informed of the offence committed in town he used to send for the Kotwal and the muhtasib and order

---

1. Mirat, I, p. 282.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Mirat, I, pp. 282-283.
6. Fryer, I, p.237.
7. Khafi Khan, II, p.606.
8. Mirat, I, p.338.

them to arrest the offender and make necessary inquiries.[1]

6. He also acted as notary public.[2]

PROCEDURE IN THE COURT:

According to the *Fatāwā-i-Ālamgīrī* in civil cases the plaintiff had to submit his complaint directly as the Qāzī came and sat in his court.[3] Thereupon the opposite party was summoned and asked to admit or deny the complaint.[4] If the defendant denied, the allegation the plaintiff was asked to produce witnesses (or evidence). The defendant also was to be given an opportunity to bring counter-witnesses.[5] The qāzī, after weighing the evidence presented by both the parties, pronounced the judgement.

Generally, two witnesses were sufficient to establish a claim or dismiss it.[6] The evidence was usually oral.[7] The

1. *Vakīl Report*, Bundle No.9, document No.977, dated 21st Ramzan, 1106 A.H.
2. *EF (1618-21)*, p.81.
3. *Fatāwā-i-Ālamgīrī*, III, p.1.
4. *Fatāwā-i-Ālamgīrī*, III, p.87.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-87; Manucci, I, pp. 199-200; *Ibid.*, III, p.264.
6. *Akhbārāt*, document No.181, dated 13 Rajab, 1091 A.H.; *Ibid.*, dated 12th Safar, 24th year of Aurangzeb; Gaudfroy-Demombynes, *Muslim Institutions*, p.149; Gibb and Bowen, *Islamic Soviety and West*, I, part II, p.131.
7. *Ibid.*

testimony of close relations of either of the party was not accepted.[1] In one case, for example, there was a disputed piece of land at Jai Singh pūra, Burhānpūr. The people of Mahārāja Bishan Singh claimed that it belonged to the Rāja because it lay within the limits of Jai Singh pūra. But the weavers of the locality pleaded that it was theirs because it was in their possession. Suits were filed in the court of qāzī of Burhānpūr. The qāzī on hearing the whole case failed to arrive at a decision. He then asked for the Royal farmān issued to Mirzā Rāja Jai Singh. But the farmān contained no mention of the piece of land in question. The qāzī thereupon gave the verdict that since the land in question was not mentioned in the farmān and the other evidence produced by the men of Rāja was not sufficient, the claim of Rāja was not acceptable and the land belonged to the weavers.[2]

The cases could also be settled by taking oaths if either party insisted on it and the plaintiff or the defendent took it to the satisfaction of the other party, and the qāzī had no objection.[3]

---

1. Akhbārāt, document No.76, dated 13th Ṣafar, 1104 A.H.
2. Akhbārāt, dated 28th Zīlhijja 37th year of Aurangzeb.
3. Thevenot, p.27; Ovington, p.138.

In criminal cases, however, the procedure was simple. There was no system of commitment for trial; and all the criminal courts followed the same practice.[1] The complaint could be presented personally or through a representative.[2] The court could summon the accused at once or after hearing the evidence produced by the complainant.[3] Thereafter, the Kotwāl, who acted as prosecutor, was asked to present his arguments. This done, the qāzī then viewed the whole case in the light of evidence and counter-evidence, if any; and if he was satisfied that the accused had committed the crime, he pronounced judgement, to be executed by the Kotwāl.[4] And if there was some doubt, or he was not satisfied with the evidence and the arguments, he withheld his decision pending personal inquiry.[5]

The accused sentenced by the court of the qāzī was handed over to the Kotwāl.[6] With regard to the sentence, the

---

1. See the criminal penal code prepared under Aurangzeb and given in a farmān preserved in Mirāt, I, pp. 278-283.

2. Vakīl Report, Bundle No.9, document No.977, dated 21st Ramzan 1106 A.H. Allāhābād Document, 503, Ibid., 12276. For cases which were represented through Vakīls, see MS. B.M.Add. 22714, f.8 ab; The Embassy, p.260; Khāfī Khān, II, pp. 257-258.

3. Selected Documents (Aurangzeb), p.105.

4. For Kotwāl acting as prosecutor in criminal cases, see Mirāt, I, pp. 282-283.

5. Waqāʼi-i-Ajmer, I, p.38; Selected Waqāʼi of the Deccan, pp. 95, 83.

6. Mirāt, I, p.283.

qāzī had no objection if chosen by the aggreived party either to demand blood for blood or cash for blood. Both were permitted under Muslim law.[1]

The case could be heard in the absence of the accused, but the prosecution witnesses were recalled when the accused was arrested and his trial began.[2] If the plaintiff himself, or his representative, was absent, the accused could be freed.[3] But a judgement could not be pronounced in the absence of both the parties or their representative (Vakīl).[4]

Release on bail in every case could be asked.[5] But it was well within the powers of the qāzī to decide whether the bail was permissible in a particular case.[6]

---

1. In one murder case the aggreived party demanded retaliation, see Akhbārāt, dated 24th Zilqáda, 1111 A.H. Retaliation could be lapsed if the murderer and the heirs of the murdered agreed among themselves for a certain amount of money. For details on the subject, see Fatwā-i-'Alamgīrī, IV, pp. 631-632.

2. Kitāb-ul-Ikhtiyār, Ms. Add. 22714, f.35; Hidāyat-al-Qavānīn f.20.

3. Ibid.

4. Fatāvá-i-Ālamgīrī, III, pp. 519-520.

5. Manucci, II, p.199; Tazkira-i-'Ulamā, p.53, MS. Add. 22714, f.6.

6. Mirāt, I, pp. 276-282. However, in cognisable cases the bail as a rule was not allowed, MS. Add. 22714, f.6ab.

The authority to transfer cases from one court to another was vested in the Emperor[1] or the governors.[2] The plaintiff and the defendant could also ask it to be transferred to another court.[3]

JUDGEMENT:

The judgements, except such as threatened to have dangerous consequences for the government, were pronounced in open court.[4] A qāzī was usually bound by decisions on facts taken by his predecessors, as is shown by the record of cases when a party sought to revive an old dispute.[5] The copy of the judgement could be sought by both the parties.[6]

An individual, if dissatisfied with the decision passed in his case by the qāzī of a town, could appeal to the governor or finally to the emperor.[7] There are a large number

1. Manucci, I, p.128.

2. Akhbārāt, document No. 3293, dated 8th Shawwāl, 38th year of Aurangzeb; Manucci, III, p. 128.

3. Waqiʿāt-i-ʿĀlamgīrī, pp. 32-35.

4. Manrique, II, p.189; Sarkar, Mughal Administration, pp. 22-23-24.

5. Allāhābād Document, 11989.

6. EF (1618-21), p.322.

7. Lubbut-Tawārīkh-i-Hind, f. 65ab.

of cases on record in which appeals were filed in higher courts,[1] which could try the case, submitted to them afresh,[2] grant bail,[3] take additional evidence,[4] postpone it,[5] confirm, modify or reverse the decision of the court which had earlier pronounced on it.[6]

EXECUTION OF SENTENCE:

The qāzī was required to get the sentence executed in his presence.[7] In criminal cases the judgement was usually executed by the Kotwāl who had the responsibility to see that the sentence passed by the qāzī was carried out either in jail, at Chabutra (Kotwāl's court) or at an open place depending on the nature of sentence. The fine imposed by the qāzī in criminal cases was also realized by the Kotwāls

---

1. For the cases in which the appeals were heard and judgements passed. See Manucci, I, pp.174-175; Ibid., pp.199-200; Ibid., III, p.264; Waqāt-i-Ālamgiri, p.72.
2. Manucci, I, pp. 199-200.
3. Tazkira-i-Ulamā, p.53.
4. Manucci, I, pp. 199-200.
5. Waqāiāt-i-Ālamgiri, p.78.
6. Manucci, I, pp. 204, 174-175.
7. In a farmān, Aurangzeb emphasized that the qāzī should get the sentence executed in his own presence. See Mirat, I, pp.278-283. The farmān dated 16th June 1672, was issued to the Diwan of Gujarat.

men.[1] In civil cases, too, for the execution of the judgement, the qāzī could seek the help of the faujdār and the Kotwāl.[2] Otherwise, normally his decrees were executed by the amin-i-diwānī and the mirdahas attached to his court.[3] In case of default on payment, the debtor could be imprisoned.[4]

WORKING OF THE COURT:

The qāzī held his court in the principal mosque of the town or in the Kachehrī of the faujdār or at any other specious public building erected or available for the purpose,[5] but never in his own house.[6] While in the court, the qāzī sat on a carpetted floor with large pillow at his back[7] and wore the gown (abā) and a turban on head.[8] The court was held five days in the week. Fridays were holidays and on Wednesdays the Qāzī attended the courts of the sūbahdār of faujdār.[9]

1. Ibid., pp. 282, 283, 293.
2. See the instructions given to the faujdār and the Kotwāl, Āīn, I, pp. 283, 284, 285.
3. Allāhābād Document, 503; Ibid., 10704; MS, B.M.Add. 1779, quoted by M.B.Ahmad, p.200.
4. Manucci, III, p.263; Hidāyah, p. 338.
5. Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, p.147; Selected Waqāi', p.79; Allāhābād Document, No.204; Khāfī Khān (for spacious building), II, p.258.
6. Waqāi'-i-Ajmer, I, p.190.
7. Manucci, III, p.210.
8. Ibid.,
9. Mirāt, I, 275.

According to the *Mirāt*, the *qāzi*'s court worked from two *gharis* (about 46 minutes) after day-break to a little after midday. He could go home at the time of *zuhr* prayer.[1] The *qāzi* was enjoined, while trying the cases, not to favour any of the parties and discount recommendations and always to look to the *shari'at* for the decision of cases.[2]

Quick proceeding in the cases under hearing was urged.[3] Occasionally, instructions were issued to the *qāzis* to expedite trials, especially in criminal cases.[4] In civil cases, however, business was slow and it usually took months before judgement was decreed.[5] This was perhaps because of the emphasis laid in the *shari'at* on compromise between the parties.[6]

The work of the court was closely watched by the *akhbārnavis* who kept the imperial government informed.[7] If

---

1. *Ibid.*

2. *Hidāyat-al-Qawānin*, f.20.

3. "Those who apply for justice", says *Āin*, "let them not be inflicted with delay and expectation. Let him object to no one on account of his religion or sect." *Āin*, I, p.283. See also Bernier, p.236; Manucci, III, p.262; Manrique, II, p.189.

4. *Mirāt*, I, pp. 282-283.

5. *Tuzuk*, p. 306.

6. Khāfī Khān, II, p.439.

7. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), pp.162,218; *Mirāt*, I,336; Manucci, II, p.331.

any deliquency on the part of judiciary was suspected, an enquiry was made without delay,[1] and those who were found guilty might even receive capital punishments.[2]

OFFICIALS:

The muftī was the giver of fatwa[3] which was regarded as a formal legal opinion given by a canon lawyer of standing, in answer to a question submitted to him either by a judge or by a private ~~xx~~ individual. On the basis of such an opinion a judge might decide a case, or an individual might regulate his personal life. But it was required that the fatwa should be rendered in precise accordance with fixed precedent because a muftī could not follow his own judgement. Moreover, a fatwa was applicable only in cases such as marriage, inheritance and divorce.[4]

In the court of the qāzī, whenever the muftī found that the judgement proposed to be given by the qāzī in a particular case was opposed to all precedents, he could, according to Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn, advise him thus: "Sir,

---

1. Mirāt, I, p.275; Sarkar, Anecdotes, p.94.

2. Manrique, II, p.149.

3. Dastūr, B.M. Add. 6599, f.38a; Ency. of Islam, II, p.92; Barnī, p.441; Farmān-i-Salātīn, p. 93.

4. Muslim Institution, p.153; Ency. of Islam, II, p.92.

in a similar case, reported in such and such a book the judgement given is this. It will be better if you pronounce your own judgement after reading this book."[1] This shows that the job of the muftī was simply to point out a precedent. His opinion was never binding on the qāzī who might reject or accept it.[2]

The muftī was supposed to be well read in Qurān, Hadīs Sunna, Ijmā and Qiyās. He was urged to spend his leisure hours in reading books on jurisprudence and the reports of cases from which one can learn legal precedents.[3]

It is not clear from the records of the period whether the muftīs were regularly appointed to all the courts. However in a few cases the appointment appears to be of reguler nature.[4] At Ahmadābād as many as three muftīs were attached to the court of the qāzī.[5] His office carried no salary but a revenue

1. Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn, f. 21a.

2. Dastūr, B.M. Add. 6599, f. 38a.

3. Hidāyat-al-Qawānīn, f. 21 ab.

4. According to a sanad (Ālamgīrī), Shaikh Muhd. Mamzād was appointed muftī of Ujjain after the death of Shaikh Aminuddin. Farāmīn-i-Salātīn, f.93; Allāhābād Document, 11990; Ibid. 2303; For muftī attached to qazi's court, see Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, ff. 64a, 65b.

5. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.174.

grant could be assigned to a man of high reputation. In addition to this, the exaction of a fee, proportionate to the wealth of the party, for delivering the fatwa, was permitted.[1]

The mir-'adl was an associate of the qazi whose duty was to carry out the findings of the qazi.[2] He also submitted a report on the facts and the cases made over to him by the qazi.[3] He was a sort of superior clerk and had no judicial powers for trying the cases.[4]

The daroga-i-'adalat was constantly in attendance at the court. His duty was to present before the court the people who had come to seek redress.[5] He used to be a mansabdar but it was not necessary in his case that he should be an expert in Muslim law.[6]

The Vakil-i Shar'i (or Vakil-i Sarkar)[7] was appointed to plead in cases on behalf of the state. He was a whole time

1. Islamic Society, I (Part II) p.137.
2. Ain, I, p. 283.
3. Dastur, B.M. Add. 6599, f. 38a.
4. Ibid.
5. Dastur, B.M. Add. 26239, f.42; Ibid., 6599, f. 38ab. 'Alamgirnama, p. 1077; Mirat, I, p. 371.
6. Faramin-i-Salatin, p.149.
7. Khafi Khan, II, pp. 249-252; Mirat (Suppl.), p.174.

employee appointed by the provincial *qāzī* or the chief *qāzī*. His remuneration was one rupee a day.[1] He was also directed to give legal advice to the poor. According to a *farmān*, his main duties were: to conduct suits on behalf of the state; to get the decree obtained by the state executed and to act as legal advisor for the property held by the *qāzī* under trusteeship. The nobles, officers and individuals also could employ their own *Vakīls* to act on their behalf.[2]

The *sakkāk* (clerk) used to write the judgements dictated by the *qāzī*. His pay was 8 annas per day and he was assigned a conditional (*mashrūt*) *mansab*.[3]

The *munāsīkhanavīs* also was a clerk who wrote the inheritance deeds and took security bonds from all those who wished to attend the court whether a plaintiff, defendant or witness. He received 8 annas per day and had conditional *mansab*. At Ahmadābād there were three *munāsīkhanavīs* attached to *qāzīs* court.[4]

---

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Farāmin-i-Salātīn*, p. 152.
3. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.174.
4. *Ibid.*

The *mushrif* was an accountant who kept whatever money was collected on account of fine in civil cases. At Ahmadabad, too, he was paid 8 annas per day from the treasury and had a royal *sanad* for his appointment.[1]

The *Peshkār* used to collect the papers concerning the suits filed and present them before the court.[2]

The *daftaris* were the peons attached to the court of the *qāzī* for doing petty jobs and keeping attendance on him. Their number was normally four or five.[3]

The *mirdahs* were mace-bearers who looked after the security measures at and around the court. They were also employed to call in the plaintiff, the defendant and the witness whenever required during the course of hearing. In civil cases they carried out the orders of the *qāzī* for the execution of sentence and helped the *amīn* in the collection of the fines.[4]

The *nāzir* was in charge of the court building and whatever was kept there.[5]

---

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Allāhābād Document*, 619.
3. *Farāmīn-i-Salātīn*, p. 228.
4. *Allāhābād Document*, 603; *Ibid.*, 10704; See also *MS*, B.M. Add. 1779.
5. *Allāhābād Document*, 12276.

The *sāhibul majlis* was employed to read over the deposition of witnesses in the court whenever *mahzar* or public testimony was held.[1]

THE POSITION OF QĀZĪ:

The position and status of the qāzī in town administration *vis-a-vis* the *sūbahdār*, the *faujdār*, the *qiladār* and the Commander of the army was at times that of subordinate and at times that of a colleague.

In theory the qāzī was an independent official appointed or dismissed at the pleasure of the emperor, but in practice he had to carry out the orders of the other high officials. Although the main jurisdiction of the qāzī was confined to hearing suits brought before him, his duties also included the task of investigation into the cases referred to him by the *sūbahdār* and the *faujdār*, and it was often on the findings of the qāzī that they decided certain cases.[2]

The qāzī had to attend the courts of the *sūbahdār* or *faujdār* and give them the judicial advice on matters in which it was required.[3] Sometimes the qāzī acted in the court of

---

1. Ibid., 11986 and 1268; *Digest of Muhammadan Law*, p.766.
2. *Selected Document* (Aurangzeb), pp. 18-19, 33; *Waqā'i-i-Ajmer*, I, pp. 13,22,26,33,37,38,172; *Waqā'i Deccan*, p.107.
3. *Waqā'i-i-Ajmer*, I, pp. 13,33,37-38.

the *faujdār* as reader of the complaints submitted, presented the cases, received the faujdar's decision and finally communicated them to the parties concerned.[1] Thus, besides imparting judicial advice, he also performed the duties of a clerk or an intermediary.

On the other hand, since the executive heads were required to act within the limits laid down by the *shariát* they had to give due weight to the advice of the *qāzī*.[2] When the *sūbahdār* sat in his court deciding cases, the *qāzī* sat along with him. The *mutasaddī* of Sūrat used to consult the *qāzī* on matters of consequence.[3] There are large number of cases when both the *faujdār* and the *qāzī* jointly held courts and jointly pronounced the judgements.[4] The complaints against misuse of authority or oppressive means adopted by the local officials, were lodged with the *qāzī*. The town people when pressed by executive and other officials looked towards the *qāzī* for redress of their grievances. In one case, a complaint was lodged by the residents of *pargana* and *qasba* Sadarpūr (*sarkār* Khairābād, *sūba* Awadh) with the *qāzī* of the above

---

1. *Selected Documents* (Aurangzeb), p.33.
2. *Mirāt*, I, pp. 257-258.
3. Ovington, pp. 136-137.
4. *Allāhābād Document*, 421, 359, 375, 370 and 1201.

qasba against the maladministration, looting and molestation by the men of the faujdār who held the qasba in ijāra. The qāzī conveyed the complaint to the sadr and the latter to the sūbahdār of Awadh.[1] In another case, a similar complaint was filed in the court of the qāzī by the residents of qasba Betmān (sarkār Mandū, sūba Mālwa) against the oppressions of one Alī Jān, the ijāradār of the town.[2] Still in another case, at the intervention of the qāzī, Shaikh Abdur Nabī, the sadr of sūba Awadh, was replaced. It so happened that this sadr took back the madad-i-maāsh comprising 400 bighas of land held by one Sayyid Muhammad. The people of the qasba complained to the qāzī against the act of gross interference by the sadr in question. The qāzī brought the matter to the notice of the chief sadr who dismissed the above sadr, and Shaikh Faiz was appointed in his place.[3]

The other town officials, such as the Kotwāl and the muhtasib, though they were not subordinate to the qāzī, had yet to obey and execute his orders. The point in question has been discussed elsewhere and therefore, needs no repetition.[4]

---

1. Allāhābād Document, 11990.
2. Mutafarriq Mahārājgan, Bundle No.3, document No.411, dated 19th Jumāda I, 1117 A.H.
3. Allāhābād Documents, 11986.
4. See Chapters II and III.

ABUSE OF AUTHORITY:

In view of the plurality of the jurisdiction and the offices enjoyed by the qāzī,[1] the sanctity attaching to his person and work, the fact that the qāzī could appeal to the emperor in the name of the sacred law[2] and the popularity which many qāzis locally had among the Muslims,[3] a large number of qāzis were found following corrupt practices and abusing their authority.

At Merta, for example, there were 71 shops attached to various temples. They were declared the ~~sk~~ state property and the income from them was to be deposited in the government treasury. But the qāzī, without letting any one know, illegally sold them to some Hindu mahājans for Rs. 70 or 80 only while the actual price of those was above Rs.200. He kept the money himself.[4]

In another case, the qāzī of Mālpwār (sūba Ajmer) in defiance of the royal orders, let some of the temples escape demolition on the payment of a large sum of money to him by the mahājans of the town.[5]

---

1. Referred above, pp.124-131.
2. The high officers, jāgīrdārs, farmers and zamīndārs were warned time and again not to interfere with the qāzī in religious matters, see Vakil Report, Bundle No.9, document No.815, undated; Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan, document No. 3193, dated 29th Shawwāl, 1129 A.H.; Akhbārāt, document No.2957, dated 18th Zilqada, 29th year of Aurangzeb.
3. Allāhābād Documents, 11986; Khāfī Khān, II, pp.256,257, 258; Shāhjahānāma, pp. 442-443.
4. Waqāi-i-Ajmer, II, 467.
5. Ibid., I, p.210.

At Jodhpūr, the qāzī and the Kotwāl combined to illegally confiscate the property of Firdaus Khawāja Sarāi. The property, when valued, included Rs. 984 in cash, one horse, two camels, one cow and clothes. Out of this only Rs.600 were deposited in Baitul māl while the rest was divided by the qāzī and the Kotwāl.[1]

Qāzī Muhammad Rashīd of Burhānpūr was accused, through a petition to the emperor (1681), of having accepted illegal gratification and delivering unjust and wrong judgements and of causing unnecessary inconvenience to the public at large. The qāzī was imprisoned and an inquiry was ordered to be conducted.[2] The qāzīs everywhere were accused of illegally charging fees from both the parties, the plaintiff as well as the defendant.[3] In addition to their madad-i-ma'āsh grants and the daily allowance (rozina), they used to charge money under a number of pretexts.[4]

Thus the qāzīs were corrupt; and fair justice in their courts was rare. Not only this, fair justice was impossible

1. Ibid., p. 213.

2. Akhbārāt, dated, 5th Zilqada 1092 A.H.

3. Hamilton, p. 321.

4. See for qāzīs realizing 4½ takas more in addition to his fixed daily allowances, Akhbārāt, document No.3314, dated 28th Jumāda II, 38th year of Aurangzeb; Ibid., document No. 411, dated 27th Jumāda II, 27th year.

because of corruption and abuse of authority practised by the qāzīs but also because a local qāzī could be pressurized, threatened or won over by a high official to give favourable judgement in a case in which the latter had some interest. This happened at Sūrat. A robbery took place in an English carāvan which was en route to Sūrat from Āgra. The robber was one of the servants of the mutasaddī of Sūrat. The English lodged a complaint with the qāzī of Sūrat. But the qāzī refused to take the testimony of the camelmen who were eye-witnesses and very well apprehended the actual robber. The qāzī rejecting the complaint argued that the camelmen in the service of the English caravan were interested parties and therefore, could not be permitted to testify. The qāzī did this at the instance of the mutasaddī. Reporting this, the English Factors at Sūrat wrote to Āgra .... "the Kāzī whoe serves as a notary publicke, refuses to take the testimony of the camelmen, pretending that they are interested parties, but the truth is they feare to informe against the lord of that place, whoe is of the cheefs nobilitie. Complaint has been made to the Governor (ṣūbahdār), but no relief is yet forth coming."[1]

---

1. EF (1618-21), p.81.

In other cases still, the Qazi's authority was extremely limited. The complaint submitted by a qazi to the emperor against an oppressive mutasaddi had no effect because the latter had friends at the imperial headquarters. It so happened that the qazi Muhammad Mah of Cambay reported to the Emperor that owing to the oppressive activities of Rustam Jang, the mutasaddi of Cambay, the people had fled from the city to Ahmadābād. Thereupon, the emperor ordered an inquiry to be conducted and he asked I'timād Khān, the diwan of Gujarāt, to look into the matter and submit a report. But the report never saw the light of the day.[1] Bernier's observation, in this regard, is that "the qazis or judges are not invested with sufficient power to redress the wrongs of these unhappy people (viz. the peasant, artisan or tradesmen) oppressed by the jāgirdārs, governors and farmers."[2].

1. Akhbārāt, dated 12th Rabī I, 1104 A.H.

2. Bernier, pp. 225, 235-36.

C H A P T E R   V

FISCAL ADMINISTRATION

MAHĀL (FISCAL DIVISION):

For the collection of various taxes, other than land revenue, known as sāir-jihāt (or sāirul wajūh)[1] the markets of big cities or ports were separately constituted into several mahāls collectively known as mahālāt sāir (or mahālāt-i sāir balda).[2] The mahāl here was a purely fiscal unit

---

1. In the administrative manuals of the period the taxes levied and collected by the Mughal government, have been classified under two heads i.e. māl-o-jihāt and sāir jihāt. The former comprised whatever was collected on account of land revenue together with other charges such as talbāna and jaribāna etc. realized to pay the expenses incurred in connexion with the assessment of land revenue. The latter, on the other hand, included "the taxes on cloth, skin, oil, food grains, articles of food and medicine, horses and camels, collected in the market place and at the Chabutra-i-Kotwālī." See Khulāsat-us-Siyāq, f.77a; Dastūr-al amal, B.M.Add.6599. ff.47ab, 48a,44ab,45a etc. The Āīn says, "whatever was assessed on the cultivated land in accordance with the rai or crop rates was known as māl. Whatever was collected from various kinds of arts and crafts was termed jihāt and the rest of the taxes came to be known as sāir jihāt." (Āīn, I,p.205). The meaning of the terms māl-o-jihāt, sāir jihāt and sāir ul wajūh has also been examined in some datils by late N.A.Siddiqi in his 'Mughal Land Revenue Administration', Appendix C,pp. 155-161; See also I.Habib, 'The Agrarian System',pp.99n, 171, 243n,259n,299.
2. For mahālat-i-sāir, see Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq,f.69b; for mahālat-i-sāir at Ahmadābād, see Mirāt (Suppl.),pp.182,183, 184; for Kābul, see Dastūr-al amal Shāhjahānī,M.B.Add. 6588, f.23a. For mahālat-i sāir at Sūrat, see MS.Fraser,No.124, f.123a. For mahālat-i-sāir-i balda at Burhānpūr, see, Khulāsatul Hind, pp. 93,94,95. The various mahāls mentioned in the above sources were mahāl mandī (bāzār), mahāl dārulzarb (mint), mahāl mandī chūb (wood market), mahāl

Contd....

(division) distinct from territorial-cum-fiscal division known as *pargana* comprising a number of villages.[1] This was done (i) in order to facilitate the work of revenue collection under different heads at different places in the city; (ii) to avoid the confusion that might arise if the realization of land revenue (*māl-o-jihāt*) from the villages was intermixed with the income or taxes (*sāir jihāt*) levied in cities and the work of collection was assigned to one and the same collector. Although the designation of a number of revenue administrators and collectors both for land revenue and the city taxes was common, both being named, for example, *amīn*, *karorī*, *qānūngo*, *chaudharī* and *mutasaddī*, they were separately appointed and had different kinds of functions. However, it does not mean that *mahāl sāir* (or *mahālat-i-sāir*) was not

(Continued from the previous page)

farza (custom house), mahāl khushkī (where the tax on goods brought by land was realized), mahāl namak sār (salt market), mahal peth-nakhāsa (cattle market), mahāl jauharī bāzār-o-manhārī (market for jewels and bangles), and mahāl *chabutra-i-Kotwālī* etc. In small towns, on the other hand, there did not exist so many mahāls and the entire mahsūl (*sāir jihāt*) was collected only at *Chabutra-i-Kotwālī*.

1. For mahāl as purely a fiscal unit, see *Khwāja Yāsin*, f. 80b, see Bāl Krishna Brahman, ff.103b-104b, for market dues (mahsūl-i sāir), at *parganas* of Hansi and Hisār, which were regarded as a separate charge from the general revenue of the parganas sometimes retained in Khālisa and sometimes given in assignment. Mahāl sāir, at Ahmadabad, at times retained in Khālisa or held in jāgir by the Nāzim, See *Mirāt*, (Suppl.), p.181.

included in Khālisa or jāgir. The taxes collected from towns were merely grouped separately. The sarkār of Sūrat, for example, contained 31 mahāls out of which 30 were parganas and one was mahāl-i balda. The latter included taxes collected in Surat city alone and comprised the income from the city, mint and Ghallamandī, etc.[1] Similarly, the sarkār hawīlī Ahmadābād in all had 33 mahāls out of which two mahāls namely Katrapārcha and sāir belonged to the city, having their own collectors.[2] The number of mahāls depended upon the size of the city and the magnitude of commercial activities therein. A big city like Burhānpūr or Aurangābād, for example, contained as many as 28[3] and 36[4] mahāls respectively. At Ahmadābād the main divisions were two-mahāl Katrapārcha and mahāl sāir. The former, for realizing tolls and dues, was further divided into 20 nākas (custom stations) and as many as 33 parganas

---

1. See Mirāt (Suppl.), p.223.

2. Ibid., pp. 188,180,181,182,183,184.

3. Munshī Thākur Lāl has mentioned 28 mahāls at Burhānpūr belonging exclusively to the city, see Dastūr, B.M. Add. 22831, ff. 23ab, 24a. But according to the Khulāsatul Hind, the number of mahāls belonging to the above city was 35 and the total income from them was Rs. 3,06,202 and Annas 5 See pp. 93,94,95.

4. For mahālat-i-sāir balda Aurangabad, See Khulāsatul Hind, pp. 127-128. The number of mahāls was 36 with total income Rs. 4,84,195.

and *qasbas* were attached to this *mahāl*. The latter comprised about 6 *mahāls* e.g. *mahāl mandi* (consisting of in all 19 *mandis*), *mahāl nakhāsa*, *mahāl jauhari o manhāri*, *mahāl dārulzarb*, *mahāl darībapān* and *mahāl kirāya dukān*.[1] At Kābul there were 7 *mahāls*, namely, *bāzār*, *mandi*, *path-nakhāsa*, *chabūtra-i-kotwāli*, *dārulzarb*, *jihāt bāzār* and *bargadi* (probably the mart where leaves and grass were sold).[2] While at Sūrat *mahālāt-i sāir* included *mahāl farza*, *mahāl khushki*, *mahāl dārulzarb*, *mahāl ghallamandī*, *mahāl jahāzāt*, *mahāl namaksār*, *mahāl chabūtra-i kotwāli* and *mahāl dallāli jauhari o manhāri*.[3] In case of small towns the entire *mahsūl-i mahāl sāir* was collected at the *Chabūtra-i-Kotwāli*.[4]

ARTICLES TAXED:

Whatever was brought to the city for sale was usually taxable. The broad articles taxed in the markets included clothes, skin, oil, food-grains, articles of food, medicine, horses, camels, cows *etc.*[5] According to one *dastūr*, the other taxable items were the oil mills, the property found lying

---

1. For Ahmadābād see *Mirāt* (Suppl.), pp. 180, 181, 183, 184.
2. *Dastūr*, B.M. Add. 6588, f. 23a.
3. MS. Fraser No.124, f. 123a.
4. See Chapter II, pp. 76-77.
5. *Khulāsat-us Siyāq*, f. 13b.

on the ground or dug up from the earth, shops, ferry, cow-grazing, cattle (gāu-shumārī), produce from the gardens, fish and other products from water, wood-market, etc.[1] The taxes thus levied on were shown in the jama' of the city as ḥāṣil-i sā'ir (or maḥṣūl-i sā'ir).[2]

AMOUNT:

About the amount collected on account of the market dues on sale and purchase, we do not get much quantitative data from our sources. They do not also appear to have made any marked distinction between the taxes collected in and around the city such as custom charges, transit duty, octroi charges, tax on sale and purchase, as classified at present. They only use two ambiguous terms i.e. maḥṣūl (denoting the tax levied or due to be collected) and ḥāṣil (implying the actual collection made) for all taxes legally charged such as maḥṣūl-i hāṭ, maḥṣūl-i farzā maḥṣūl-i mandī, maḥṣūl-i māl, maḥṣūl bar kharīd o firūkht and maḥṣūl charged at nākas .

However, the Akbarnāma referring to the tax on sale and purchase states that ½% of the value should be charged

1. Dastūr-ūl 'amal-i-Mujmalāī, ff. 28a-29a; Siyāq Nāma, p. 307; Dastūr-ūl-'amal-i-'Ālamgīrī, 28b.

2. Khwāja Yasīn, f. 66b.

from the purchaser, 1½% from the seller and ½% from both on account of *inām*[1] (which probably meant brokerage); in all the 2½%.[2] Under Jahāngīr and Shāhjahān, the official rates for all legal levies also remained at one in forty.[3] But in his eighth regnal year Aurangzeb enforced a general regulation with regard to market dues and all other legal levies and the rates prescribed were 2½% from Muslims and 5% from Hindus; and in case of foreigners 3½%.[4] The above rate was made general throughout the empire, and collection at higher rates was prohibited. The articles valued at less than Rs. fifty two and half were declared exempted.[5]

COLLECTION:

The market dues could be collected either when a commodity was bought or when it was sold. A double tax on

---

1. *Akbarnāma*, III, p.394.

2. *Āīn*, I, p.204.

3. *Tuzuk*, pp. 206-207. The point in question has been discussed in a separate paper by the present writer. See '*The Custom and the customhouse at Sūrat in the 17th century*, pub. *QRHS*, Vol.X (1970-71), No.2, pp.84-96.

4. *Mirāt*, I, pp.258-259; *Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq*, f. 69b; *Akhbārāt*, dated 13th Rabī II, 10th year; *Ibid*, document No. 2946, dated 10th Zilqada 29th year of Aurangzeb.

5. *Mirāt*, I, pp. 258-259.

a single commodity and from the same person was prohibited.[1] However, the goods brought to the market was liable to be taxed each time it changed hands between buyer and seller. The question, whether the levy was to be collected when an article was purchased by the merchant from the producer or when it was sold by one merchant to another, led to the promulgation of a number of regulations.

According to the Mir'āt, the zakāt-i ainās (market dues) was realised at the time of purchase and the tax-collectors (ashirān) issued a permit (rawanna) to the merchants to be shown, if the commodity was transported out of the city for re-sale, at custom chaukīs (nākas) and at chabūtra-i māl, so that a double levy could be avoided.[2] But it was found that the practise led the government to suffer considerably on account of revenue, since the price of an article was higher at the time of its sale than at the time of its purchase.[3] In 1689, it was ordered that the market levy should be collected at the time of sale in the hope that the revenue would increase.[4] But soon it was discovered that the new

1. Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, f. 60a.
2. Mir'āt, I, p.318.
3. Mir'āt, I, p.318.
4. Ibid.

regulation was no solution to the real problem. The merchants in order to evade the custom sold their goods at places where the custom dues was not regularly collected.[1] The government after a series of consultations and on the advice of Qāzī Muḥammad Akrām, who went into the legal aspect whether it was permissible under the sacred law to tax a commodity at the time of purchase, decided to reimpose the earlier regulation that the tax in the market should be collected at the time and place of purchase.[2]

In case of merchandise meant for export, the custom was realised only at ports, irrespective of their places of purchase. The plea taken, at the complaints of the mutasaddīs of Surat and Cambay, in the above arrangement was that if the levy was collected at the place of purchase (dar makān-i kharīddārī) the income of the ports might suffer.[3]

ORGANISATION OF VARIOUS MAHĀLS:

Mahāl Katrapārcha:

As the very name indicates, the mahāl katrapārcha comprised dues and levies on cloth of all sorts - cotton, ~~xx~~ silk

---

1. Ibid., p.319.
2. Ibid., pp. 339-340.
3. Mirāt, I, pp. 339-340, 342-343.

woollen, yearn, raw cotton, jute, flex and skin etc.[1] It existed in almost all the principal cities.[2] According to the *Mirāt*, a small duty under the name of brokerage (*shukr-i dallālī*) on merchandise brought for sale at Ahmadābād used to be levied in the suburbs and *mandīs*; but in the reign of Aurangzeb the rates of duty were fixed at 2½% *ad valerem* for Muslims, 5% for Hindus, and 3½% for Christians. This *mahāl* was also known as *mahāl sad pani* probably because the duty was five per cent.[3]

Mahāl sāir:

At Ahmadābād as many as 19 *mandīs* situated in and around the city belonged to this *mahāl*. The *parganas* and *qasbas* attached to this *mahāl* were the same as mentioned in connection with *Katraparcha*. Market dues here too were at par the *mahāl katraparcha*.[4]

Mahāl Nakhāsa:

This comprised the cattle market and formed a part of *mahāl sāir*.[5] At Ahmadābād, it was held along with *peth*, by

---

1. *Mirāt* (Suppl.) p.181.
2. For *mahāl Katraparcha* at Burhanpur, see *Akhbarāt*, dated 22nd Jumāda I, 48th year of Aurangzeb; *Khulāsatul Hind*, p.94.
3. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.179.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 181-82.
5. *Ibid.*; see also chapter on Market, p.195.

the Nāzim in jāgīr.[1] The dues again, were 2½% for Muslims, 5% for Hindus, 3½% for Christian and 4% for Harbi.[2]

Mahāl Jauharī o Manhārī:

This mahāl comprehended the market for jewels, gold, silver, bangles, ivory and articles of wood. The tax on purchase and sale was 2½ and 5 per cent for Muslims and Hindus respectively. Besides this, 1¼% was charged on account of brokerage on jewels. The total income from this mahāl at Ahmadābād was 10,000 dāms.[3]

Dārulzarb:

For this, see the Chapter on Mints.[4]

Pāndarība:

For the dues on betel leaves and tobacco, it formed a separate mahal but for supervision was grouped with mahāl Chabutra-i-Kotwālī.[5]

---

1. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.182.
2. Ibid.; Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, f. 59a.
3. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.183.
4. See Chapter on Mints, pp. 232, 233-34.
5. For detail see Chapter on markets, pp. 185-86.

<u>Mahāl Kirāya dūkān</u>:

This <u>mahāl</u> covered rents from the shops in the various markets. At Ahmadābād, the total income was 19,000 <u>dāms</u> and it was spent on the poor, through stipends disbursed by the provincial authorities after sanction from the Imperial Court. The officials supervising it were appointed under the seal of <u>Mīr Sāmān</u>.[1]

<u>Mahāl bāghāt</u>:

The income from the royal gardens and taxes from those owned by private persons was collected in this <u>mahāl</u> and it was deposited in the provincial treasury. Any expenditure was also met by the same treasury. Officials such as <u>Karorī</u>, <u>amīn</u>, <u>dārogha</u>, <u>mushrif</u> and <u>tahwīldār</u> were appointed under the seal of the <u>Mīr sāmān</u> at the recommendation of the provincial government.[2]

<u>Mahāl Chabutra-i-Kotwālī</u>:

For this important <u>Mahāl</u>, see Chapter II.

<u>THE OFFICIALS</u>:

We do not know much about the officials attached to various <u>mahāls</u> at different cities. Whatever information we

---

1. <u>Mirāt</u> (Suppl.), pp. 183-184; <u>Akhbārāt</u>, dated 10th Rabī II, 10th year of Aurangzeb.

2. <u>Mirāt</u> (Suppl.) pp. 184-185.

have comes from the *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī* which describes in some detail the duties of various officials appointed to different *mahāls* at Ahmadabad. The information on the subject furnished by the *Mirāt* is corroborated by the casual and scattered references in a number of sources.

OFFICIALS AT KATRAPĀRCHA:

Amīn:

His main functions appear to have been inspection and supervision of the merchandise.[1] At Ahmadābād, he was assisted by *piyādas* as well as by ten horsemen, in addition to the contingent maintained under his own *mansab*.[2] He was appointed by an Imperial *sanad* bearing the seal of the *dīwān-i-ālā*,[3] and at the recommendation of the provincial *dīwān*. According to a *dastak*, the *amīn* was instructed to work in close cooperation with merchants and other officials and he was to see that the officials attached to his *mahāl* did not take more than what had been sanctioned or agreed.[4]

---

1. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), pp.179-180; *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī*, ff. 233b-234a.
2. *Ibid*.
3. *Mirāt*, (Suppl.) p.179.
4. *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī*, ff. 240b, 241a.

Dārogha:

He was a colleague of the amīn.[1] When it was found that amīn's load of work had become so heavy that a single man could not handle it, a dārogha was appointed to help him.[2] The dārogha, too, besides the contingent under his own mansab, had ten troopers and fifty piyādas posted at various custom chaukis around the city so as to prevent evasion of custom dues.[3] The mansab of the dārogha at Shāhjahānābād was 150 zāt; later on 5 suwār were also added.[4] At Ahmadābād, the dārogha of mahāl katrapārcha also occupied the post of dārogha of Mahāl sāir and chabutra-i-kotwāli.[5] He received monthly salary from mahāl katrapārcha and it was included in the jama'wa-kharch (income and expenditure) of that mahāl.[6]

The Karori of the Mahāl Katrapārcha at Ahmadābād was first appointed in place of a corrupt dārogha in the last

---

1. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.180.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p.183, Hidāyat-al-Qawānin, f. 46a.
4. Akhbārāt, dated 12th Rajab, 24th year of Aurangzeb.
5. Ibid., p.182. Shaikh Muhd. Akbar, the dārogha-i-Katrapārcha at Ahmadābād was also the amin Pāibaqi for the entire suba. See Akhbārāt, document No. 3636, dated 28 Shabān, 50th year of Aurangzeb.
6. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.180.

years of Aurangzeb's reign, during the viceroyalty of Prince Muhammad A'zam; but the post was abolished a little later. The post was revived in the reign of Bahādur Shāh.[1] The *Mirat* does not clearly state the duties of *Karori*. However, from Khwāja Yāsin, it appears that this official, under the designation of *Karora*, was in charge of recording the prices of the commodities and the collection of custom charges.[2]

The *mushrif* was a treasurer appointed by *sanad* from the *diwan-i-'ala*, on the recommendation of the provincial *diwan*.[3] His pay at Ahmadābād was Rs.65 per month; and he was paid from the above *mahāl*.[4] His work was to receive the cash and keep the money collected at various places attached to the *Katraparcha*.[5]

The *Tahwildār* was the cashier at the treasury, appointed by Imperial *sanad* and on the recommendation of the provincial *diwān*.[6] At Ahmadabad, the *Tahwildār* of the *mahāl* Katrapārcha also held the *tahwildāri* of the *mahāl*

1. *Ibid.*
2. Khwāja Yāsin, f. 76b.
3. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.179.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
5. Jawāhar Nāth Bekās, ff. 27b, 28a.
6. *Mirāt* (Suppl.) p.183.

sāir and mahāl Nakhāsa.[1] His pay was Rs.70 per month and received it from *mahsūl-i-mahāl katrapārcha*.[2]

The *Qānūngo* kept a record of prices. He too was appointed by royal *sanad* and received a part of custom.[3]

The other *mahāls* such as *mahāl sāir*, *peth-nakhāsa*, *jauharī o manhārī*, *pāndarība*, *Chabūtra-i-Kotwālī*, *Kirāya dūkān*, *dārul zarb*, *etc.* too had the same officials with similar duties.[4] We frequently hear one official working in two *mahāls* either on the same post or often on different posts. As noted above one *tahwīldār* was appointed to work in three *mahāls*, *i.e.* *Katrapārcha*, *sāir* and *nakhāsa* against the same post.[5] Similarly the *Kotwāl* at Ahmadābād in addition to his duties of *Karorī* of *mahāl Katrapārcha* also had the *pāndarība* under his authority.[6] At Shāhjahānābād the *waqāi-navīs* attached to *Chabūtra-i-Kotwālī* was also the *amīn* and *nirkhī* of tobacco market.[7] Again, at Ahmadabad the

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 183.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, p. 182.
5. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.183.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī*, f. 240ab.

mushrif both for *Katraparcha* and *sair* was one and the same person.[1] At Sūrat also there was one *dārogha* for both *sāir* and *Katrapārcha*.[2] In the 50th year of Aurangzeb, the *dārogha* of *Katrapārcha* at Ahmadābād was also the *amin* of *Pālbagi*.[3] A newly appointed *diwān* of Ahmadābād is shown as occupying a number of offices under his charge: He was *diwān*, *dārogha* of *Katrapārcha*, *dārogha* of *sāir*, *amin* and *faujdār* of Dholqa, *amin* and *faujdār* of *pargana* Patlad, *amin* and *faujdār* of *hawili* Ahmadābād, *amin* of the *Chabutra-i-Nakhāsa* and *Karori* and *amin* of *Katrapārcha*, in all 12 posts.[4]

Despite the above departmental intermingling of the services of officials it does not mean that their *mansabs* and pay were uniform. The *mansab* and pay were determined by the load of work, the place of appointment and the status of the appointee. The *dārogha* of *sāir* at Ahmadābād, for example, received Rs. 600 per month[5] while the pay of its counterpart in *mahāl nakhāsa* was only 70.[6] The *mushrif* of *sāir* was paid Rs. 70 per month but the *mushrifs* in *mahāl nakhāsa*, *jauhari*

---

1. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.182.
2. MS. Fraser 124, ff. 97b, 98a.
3. *Akhbārāt*, document No.3631, dated 28th Shabān, 50th year of Aurangzeb.
4. See MS. Fraser 124, ff. 29b, 30a, 144b.
5. *Mirāt* (Suppl.) p.182.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 183.

bāzār and dārulzarb received Rs. 35 or 30 respectively.[1] The tahwīldār of katrapārcha was paid Rs. 70[2] while in sāir his pay was only Rs. 20 p.m.[3]

CUSTOM CHAUKĪS (NĀKAS):

The dārogha or amīn (or 'amil)[4] and mutasaddīs[5] used to maintain custom chaukīs (custom-cum-watch posts) around the cities where the merchandise brought to the city was checked, and the custom collected. In case of merchandise taken out of the city no tax was charged at the custom stations. The agents of mutasaddīs and dārogha used to issue dastak to be shown at the Chabūtra-i-māl in the city to ensure that the mahsūl-i-māl (custom charges) had already been paid so that

---

1. Ibid., p. 183.
2. Ibid., p. 180.
3. Ibid., p. 182.
4. For custom chaukīs around Murshidābād maintained by the dārogha or 'amil, see Kāghazāt-i Mutafarriq, f. 58b. Around the city of Ahmadābād, there were 19 nākas (or custom stations attached to Mahāl Katrapārcha and mahāl sāir. Here mutasaddīs had their agents who used to issue chitthī zabt-i mahsūl (or receipt for custom dues) bearing the seal of mutasaddi after duely entering the dues payable on the various articles of merchandise. On being paid the dues they would allow the merchandise to pass. See Mirāt, (Suppl.) pp. 180-181.
5. For further references on custom stations, see Pelsaert, p.43; Tavernier, II, pp.24-25; Master I, p.275. For custom stations around Multān maintained by amīn and dārogha, see Akhbārāt, dated 13th Rabī II, 10th year of Aurangzeb; custom station at Mathura, see Vakil Report, Bundle No.I, document No.161, dated 1100 A.H. Monserrate, pp.79-80; Pietro Della Valle, I, p.63; William Hedge, I, p.106.

a commodity might not be taxed twice.[1] In case of exports from the city the merchants again had to show the receipt that they had paid the custom in the city; otherwise the custom agents would not let the cart passed without charging the custom.[2] Nothing as far as possible went unnoticed there.[3] If any thing was smuggled in and custom was evaded at the *chaukis*, it was to be taxed at market place.[4] Those who were found evading the custom were to be produced before the *mutasaddi* or the *dārogha* attached to *Chabutra-i māl*.[5]

The custom *chaukis* at times could be in *khālisa* or *jāgir* or given out on *ijāra*.[6] If they were in *khālisa*, the officials attached were to be *Bādshāhi*, *i.e.* appointed by the Emperor, and the money collected was deposited in royal treasury.[7] In case of their being given in *jāgir*, the officials were agents of *jāgirdārs*, and the money collected was kept by the assignees.[8]

---

1. *Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq*, f. 58b; *Mirāt* (Suppl.) pp.180-181.
2. *Mirāt*, I, pp. 258-259.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 263.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq*, f. 58b.
6. *Mirāt*, I, p.292.
7. *Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq*, ff. 59b, 60ab.
8. See *Vakil Report*, Bundle No.1, document No.161, dated 1100 A.H.

TOWNS WITHIN JĀGIR:

As per practice, the mansabdārs in the Mughal empire were paid either in cash (known as naqd) or in assignments (jāgīr or tuyūl) from which they were entitled to collect the land revenue and certain other taxes, assigned also the taxes levied or collected in and around the cities. The jāgīr of a noble could also include the income from the markets of big cities or ports when those comprised separate mahāls with fixed incomes. Thus, as mentioned in the Mirāt, the mahāl sā'ir and mahāl nakhāsa at Ahmadābād at times were included in jāgīr-i sharti (conditional jāgīr) of Nāzim-i-sūba and often retained in khālisa.[1] At the port of Sūrat,[2] Cambay,[3] Broach[4] and Huglī[5] the mahāl farza and the mahāl khushkī sometimes were held in jāgīr and sometimes kept in khālisa. Similarly sometimes the income exclusively from the city formed the jāgīr of a noble while sometimes the income

---

1. Mirāt (Suppl.), pp. 181-182; Mirāt, I, p.292.

2. Several times the income from the port of Sūrat was assigned in jāgīr to the Princes and Princesses of royal blood. For references, see Mirāt, I, p.219; Letters Received, IV, p.293; EF (1622-23), p.249; Ibid (1624-29) p.152; Manucci, I, p.63.

3. For Cambay, see Foster, A Supplementary Calender, p.69.

4. For the tuyūl of Broach held by Shihābuddīn Khān, see Akbarnāma, III, p.438.

5. The port of Huglī was jāgīr of Shā'ista Khān, See Master, II, pp. 79-80.

from the town together with the land revenue from the villages around was held in assignment.[1]

In a document (*fard*), a detailed account is given of various *jāgīrdārs* and the name of *parganas*, attached to the *faujdārī* of Mahārāja Bishan Singh, held by them in *jāgīr*. Out of 35 *parganas* mentioned, 33 were held by assignees, while two were in the *khālisa*. The document also clearly states that the income from the *qasbas* (headquarters of the *parganas*) known as *hawālī* together with the land revenue from the nearby villages formed part of the fiscal x claims of *jāgīrdārs*. The document further reveals that for collecting the *mahsūl* from the *ganjs* of the *qasbas*, the *jāgīrdārs* appointed their own agents (or collectors) and maintained *thānas* in the towns.[2]

---

1. Khān-i-A'zam Koka was appointed the governor of Ahmadābād in 1572. He held the city of Ahmadābād in jāgīr. See *Mirāt*, I, p.119. The city of Patna was tuyūl of Ma'sūm Khān Kābulī. See *Akbarnāma*, III, p.285. The city of Hājīpūr was assigned to Shahm Khān, *Ibid*. Patan in Gujarāt Comprising two mahāls, *i.e.* sāir and qasba with jama'dāmī amounting to 25,05,000 dāms at times was held in conditional jāgīr by the Nāzim sūba Ahmadābād, *Mirāt* (Suppl.), 198-199; The qasba Toda (sūba Ajmer) was the tuyūl of Mān Singh son of Rāja Rāi Singh. See *Waqā'i-i-Ajmer*, II, p.411. For qasba Rewārī (sūba Shāhjahānābād), see *Mutafarriq Mahārājgan*, Bundle No.3, document No.484, dated 19th Rabī I, 1124 A.H.

2. The document is a copy of *fard*, sent by the Vakīl of Rāja Bishan Singh faujdār of Mathura, giving details about the jāgīrdārs who held jāgīrs within the area included in the faujdārī jurisdiction of the above Rāja. The document in question is attached to another document (*Mutafarriq Mahārājgan*) - a letter sent in the name of the above Rāja by an anonymous writer. For the above, see Bundle No. I, document No.147, undated.

Theoretically, a jāgīrdār was entitled only to collect the income from the taxes in lieu of payment of cash salary and had no other functions or powers. But in actual practice their position was much greater than that of mere tax collectors. There are a large number of documents which refer to the appointment of Kotwāls,[1] thānādārs and rāhdārs[2] by the big jāgīrdārs in areas held by them in jāgīr. But it is likely that the right of appointing a Kotwāl was conceded only to those jāgīrdārs who had both the faujdārī and the jāgīrdārī of the same area.[3] However, the appointment

---

1. For the appointment of Kotwāl by the jāgīrdārs, see Mazhar-i-Shāhjahānī, p.53; Khutūt-i-Mahārājgān, Bundle No.3 document No.578, dated 18th Ramzan 1121 A.H. Mahārāja Swai Jai Singh II got appointed one Inayat Khān, Kotwāl of Ujjain city. Akhbārāt, document No.420, dated 20th Rajab 1096 A.H. Ilahādād, the Kotwāl of Mathura, was appointed by Rāja Bishan Singh, see Khutūt-i-Mahārājgān, document No.15 dated 6th year of Aurangzeb. Bakhshī-ul Mulk, Khān Jahān Bahādur held the qasba Rewārī (sūba Shāhjahānābād) in jāgīr. He appointed his own Kotwāl and thānadārs. Ibid., Bundle No.3, document No.484, dated 19th Rabi I, 1124 A.H.

2. Ibid.; Vakīl Report, Bundle No.8, document No.767, dated 2nd Ramzan 33rd year of Aurangzeb; Qasba Mahaban (sūba Āgra) was the jāgīr of 'Umdat-ul-Mulk and there he had his own thānadār. Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, p.60; Mutafarriq Mahārājgān, Bundle No.5, document No.923, dated 7th Sha'bān, 1117 A.H.

3. The evidence for the appointment of Kotwāl by jāgīrdārs is either from Sarkār Mathura or Sarkār Ujjain which at times were both in the faujdārī and jāgīrdārī of Mahārāja of Āmer. For faujdārī and jāgīrdārī of Faizābād, see Akhbārāt, dated 14th safar, 33rd year. For faujdārī and jāgīrdārī of Hindaun and Biāna, Ibid., Ist Zīlqada 44th year of Aurangzeb.

of thānadār and rāhdār was a general practice. In case the Kotwāl of a town was appointed by the jāgīrdār himself, then his interference in town affairs could be unlimited. He could make the town life pleasant or intolerable for the residents at his will. Even the presence of the imperial officials such as the qāzī, the muhtasib and the akhbārnavīs could put no effective check over the powers of a Kotwāl so long as he was under the control of a jāgīrdār who happened to be the faujdār of the area.[1]

However, with regard to the appointment of qāzī, muftī, mīr-i-ʿadl, muhtasib, qilaʿdār, faujdār and akhbārnavīs there is not a single instance on record when the appointment of any of the above town officials was made by a jāgīrdār no matter whether he was big and small.

On fiscal side, jāgīrdārs used to appoint their own agents in various markets and maintained their own toll-

---

1. See Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan, Bundle No.4, document No.643, dated 28 Ziiqada, 36th year. This is a letter addressed to Mahārāja Bishan Singh by Safi Khān. The latter desires the former to direct his thānadār and gumāshtas posted at Atrauli not to molest the residents of the qasba any more, and to return the money they have seized from Ziyāuddin Husain. For the oppression caused by the Kotwāl and gumāshtas of Rāja Bishan Singh at Mathura by taking per force the commodities of merchants and by collecting illegal dues etc., see Vakil Report, Bundle No.8, document No.161, dated 21st Shabān, 32nd year of Aurangzeb.

stations or *chaukīs*.[1] However, so far as the basic structure of the fiscal divisions or markets for realizing taxes on various items is concerned, it seems to have been the same under *jāgīrs*, as otherwise.[2] The *jāgīrdārs* could change the fiscal structure of a city or town provided they were sure of holding their assignments permanently. The practice of frequent transfers, generally after three or four years, and the practice of frequently changing the allotments *i.e.* sometimes retaining a particular *mahāl* in *khālisa* and sometime parcelling it out in *jāgīr*, did not permit any *jāgīrdār* to make radical alternations. However, we frequently hear of certain influential *jāgīrdārs*, who in order to amass wealth, tried to establish their own *mandis* or *ganjs* at the cost of a previously established *ganj* in another assignment. But time and again the *jāgīrdārs* were warned not to adopt this method especially if it competed with a market in the *khālisa*.[3]

---

1. See *Vakīl Report*, Bundle No.9, document No.1029, undated.

2. In a *Vakīl Report* there is the mention of mahāl-i-sā'ir, Kotwālī and Ghallamandī and the custom chaukīs at Mathura, although Mathura was in the jāgīr of Rāja. See [redacted] Bundle No.8, document No.161, dated 21st Sha'bān, 32rd year of Aurangzeb.

3. See *Vakīl Report*, Bundle No.2, document No.249, dated 20th Sha'bān, 1102 A.H., Udāī Rām, the Vakīl of Rāja Rām Singh, advises the above Rāja to abolish the ganj which he newly established at Mahāban. For, it has been reported to the Emperor that the ganj established by the Rāja has ruined the ganj-i-sarkārī and therefore he (emperor) is very much displeased with him. See also *Khutūt-i-Mahārājga*, document No.2152, dated 19th Jumāda II, 1130 A.H.; Ibid, document No.2130, dated 10th Rabī II, 1130 A.H.; Ibid. document No.2604, undated etc., for similar references.

With regard to the *gumāshtas* appointed by the *jāgīrdārs* in their *jāgīrs*, we do not know whether they had similar posts, designations, work and salary to those in the *Khālisa*. We also do not know whether the *gumāshtas* posted in the *jāgīr* of a noble were locally recruited or were permanent employees of the *jāgīrdār*. Our sources simply mention that the *jāgīrdārs* had their own *gumāshtas* for the collection of market dues and other taxes. Since the assignments were transferable, and sometimes the assignee had more than one *jāgīrs* at different places, or his *jāgīr* could be far away from the place of his duty, it appears, that the *jāgīrdārs* had to rely partly on his permanent staff and partly on men locally taken into service.

Besides the above arrangement, the other practices followed by *jāgīrdārs* for arranging the collection of taxes were: (i) parcelling out parts of their *jāgīrs* to their troopers who got their pay by collecting the revenue themselves, (ii) farming out the *jāgīrs* to *ijāradārs* who arranged for the collection of the revenue and then paid a lumpsum to the *jāgīrdār*. However, both the practices were favoured more by the smaller *jāgīrdārs*.

In theory, no right, except that of collecting the taxes authorised by the Imperial *sanad*, was delegated to the *jāgīrdārs*, and they were expected to exercise this right in

conformity with imperial regulations issued from time to time. But in actual practice they could adopt several means to amass wealth. Their gumāshtas could enhance the rates of custom dues by over-valuing the merchandise while realizing the custom charges in custom house (farza), at custom chaukis (nākas) and at market places.[1] The realization of abwāb was repeatedly forbidden yet they were charged everywhere by jāgīrdārs and their agents or ijāradārs.[2] Things were still worse in case of a big and influential noble. Mentioning the situation at the port of Huglī held by Shāista Khān, Governor of Bengāl, Master wrote, "......his servants being made soe far governors as to receive all the rents, profits, perquisites, fines, customes etc. of the place, the kings governors hath little more than the name, and for the most part sits still whilts the Nobobs officers oppress the people, monopolize most commodities, even as low as grass for beats, canes, firewood, thatch etc., nor they want wages to oppress those people of all sorts who trade, whether natives

---

1. See EF (1637-41), p.100; Ibid. (1641-45) pp.23-24; Ibid. (1639-41), p.179. For the corrupt practices at Sūrat custom house when it was held by Mīr Mūsa on farming, see Marshall pp.67-68. For further references on the point, see Chapter on port administration.

2. Akhbārāt, document No.3163, dated 8th Rabī II, 35th year of Aurangzeb; Khutūt Maharaigan, Bundle No.4, document No.643, dated 28th Zilqada, 36th year of Aurangzeb; Mazhar-i Shāhjahānī, p.197; Akhbārāt dated Rabī II, 41st year of Aurangzeb.

or strangers, since whatever they doe when complained of to Decca, is palliated under the name and colour of the Nobabs interest, and that the Nobabs officers may, without controle, drive the trade of the place .....to the utter ruin of trade by other merchants.[1]"

An other instance high-lighting the cupidity of a noble, who was both __faujdār__ and __jāgīrdār__ of the __sarkār__ of Mathura (sūba Āgra), is mentioned in a Vakīl's report. The Vakīl Megh Rāj, wrote to __Rāja__ Bishan Singh that, "every man of Mathura city has reported that owing to the Mahārāja having no money, he has ordered Mannān Khwāja Sarāi, the __Kotwāl__ and other servants to collect Rs. 300 or 400 a day by all means. The __qāzī__ and other residents of the __qasba__ above mentioned, according to the __waqāinigār__, have reported that in the village Rāwal in __pargana__ Mahāban, __rās__ or __hari__ (__rāslila__) is daily organised (at the instance of __Rāja__) and the people of Mathura go to see it and Khwāja Sarāi at the time of the __rāslila__ goes to the Jamuna and collects from the people Rs. 1,½ or ¼ as the case may be. Nawāb Jumlat-al-Mulk has also written a __parwāna__ in this regard and the __hasbul-hukm__ has been issued (directing the __Rāja__) to dismiss the __Kotwāl__ Mannān Khwāja Sarāi." The __Vakīl__ further requested the Mahārāja,

---

1. See Master, II, p.80.

"to hush up the reporter before any action is taken against him."[1]

The above discussion shows that the situation in the towns held in *jāgīr* was worse than those kept in *khālisa*. The *jāgīrdārs* who were sure of the short tenures of their assignments tried to amass wealth through all possible ways. The state of affairs still were worse in the towns or ports lying within areas held by high officials in combined jurisdictions such as *subahdārī* and *jāgīrdārī*, *faujdārī* and *jāgīrdārī*. The misuse of authority by local officials could be checked through *faujdār* and *akhbārnavis*, but if a town happened to be both in the *faujdārī* and *jāgīr* of an influential noble then a *gumāshta* or *ijāradār* could not be restrained from oppression, nor a culprit, when a *waqāi'* or *guzardār* was richly bribed not to report the correct news. In a *Vakil Report Rāja* Bishan Singh (*faujdār* and *jāgīrdār* of Mathura) was advised to examine all the reports (*waqāi'*) before they were submitted to the headquarters. It is argued that since the Raja was both the *faujdār* and *jāgīrdār* of *sarkār* Mathura, it lay

1. *Vakil Report*, Bundle No.3, document No.376, dated 25th Rabī II, 1104 A.H.

2. *Vakil Report*, Bundle No.9, document No.1035, dated 1106 A.H.; *Ibid.*, document No. 996, dated 6th Ramzan 39th year Aurangzeb.

within his powers to intercept the waqā'i' reports.[1]

The bonds executed by the jāgirdārs, gumāshtas and ijāradārs, not to molest the residents for want of money and to do whatever possible for the prosperity of the people, were more in the nature of written paper pledges to be kept in the daftar dīwānī, which was an official procedure and of little actual effect. It is true, however, that there are numerous instances on record when the jāgīrdārs, if they misused authority or practice oppression, were punished by reduction in mansab, confiscation of the jāgīr and transfer. This happened sometimes at the request of the citizens and sometimes on the basis of news reports and findings of couriers, etc.

---

1. Ibid., Bundle No.8, document No.699, undated.

C H A P T E R   VI

MARKET ADMINISTRATION

MARKETS:

In the literature of the period, the various types of markets referred to are _bāzār-i kalān_ (also known as _bāzār-i chauk_, _chakla_ or _chaurāha_, the main market), _Katra_, _Mandī_ (_Joba_), _ganj_, _dariba_, _nakhāsa_, _path_, fair (_mélā_) and seasonal markets. Of the above, the first six were permanent markets _i.e._ held daily, except on public holidays. The other three were periodical _i.e._ weekly, occasional and seasonal, being organised for one day in a week or twice a week in case of _path_ (_hāt_), for a few days in case of fair around some holy place and for few months in case of seasonal markets, (_e.g._ those established at Swālly and Huglī when there was great concourse of ships).

The _Bāzār-i Kalān_[1] was confined to the principal streets of the cities and contained one or more _chauks_ (_chakla_ or _chaurāha_)- a place where four roads met.[2] The _chauks_

---

1. For _bāzār-i kalān_ or _bāzār-i khās_ (the big or main market) at Ahmadābād, see _Mirāt_ (suppl.) p.8; Pietro Della Valle, I, p.96; _Haft Iqlim_, I, p.86; Mandelslo, p.22; at Sūrat, Fryer, I, p.248; at Fātehpūr Sikri, Finch, _Early Travels_, p.149; Monserrate, p.31; at Agra, Mundy, II, pp.215-216; at Lāhore, Manrique, II, p.191; at Burhānpūr, Mundy, II, pp.50-51.

2. At Ahmadābād there were 17 chaklas or chauks connected with the main market, see _Mirāt_ (Suppl.), p.8; At Delhi for Chāndanī Chauk and Chāuk Sadullāh Khān, see _Khāfī Khān_, II, p.86; for chauk Akbarābād (Agra), see _Vakil Report_, Bundle No.4, document No.554, dated 29th Ramzan 1105 A.H., Tavernier I, p.79; _Akhbārāt_, document No.1605, dated 16th Zīlqada, 25th year Alamgir; Thevenot, pp. 59-60.

occupied the central and prominent areas of the city and was always a very crowded place.[1] Both sides of the street which housed the bāzār contained shops stretching in a big city for as long as 650 yards.[2] In a big city, there might be separate shops for each commodity,[3] while in small towns

---

1. Manrique defines the chauk as "a square and open place in the centre of a town." Manrique, II, p.191, & 113. The Chāndanī Chauk at Delhi, built by Jahān Ārā in 1640, was octagonal in shape and measured 100 by 300 yards. See Thevenot, p.60; 'Amal-i Sālih, III, p.47.

2. At Ahmadābād 'Maidan Shah' (the main market) was about 1600 feet long'; see Mandelslo, p.220; she bāzār of Chāndanī Chauk was 450 yards long, see Thevenot, p.60; Bernier, p.365. Bāzār at Fatehpur Sikri was about half a mile long, see Monserrate, p.31; Finch, Early Travels, p.149.

3. For variety of shops in the bāzār of Delhi, each selling a different commodity, for example, dūkānhā'i Jauharī, dūkānhā'i bazāz, dūkānhā'i halwā'i, āttār, mewā firosh, tambūl and sabzī firosh etc., see 'Meenābāzār' MS. No. F.H./312 ff. 3b to 5b, 6a to 8a, 9b, 10ab., 11ab, 12ab, 13ab, 14ab, 15ab, 16ab, 17ab, 18ab, 19ab & 20a. For dūkānhā'i bazāz, see Waqā'i-i Ajmer, I, pp. 33, 68; Bāyazid p.141. For the shops of different commodities and stuffs of trade again at Delhi, see Guldasta-i Sultanat, f. 33ab; Mutafarriq Mahārājgan, Bundle No. I, document No. 69, undated, refers to separate shops for each commodity and at a fixed place at Ujjain. For example, in a dispute the butchers of the above city were warned by the qāzī not to open meat shops in between the shops for other commodities. They were asked to shift to the place fixed for them. Ibid.

there could be only general engrocer's shops.[1] The main feature of the bāzār was that all sorts of goods and commodities such as clothes, grains, food stuffs, drugs, sweets, medicine, tobacco, fruit~~e~~s, vegetables, betel, furniture, toys etc. were on sale.[2] Secondly, whatever was sold there was in retail and seldom in wholesale.[3] Thirdly, the bāzār was known after the name of the principal chauk or was simply called the chauk bāzār.[4] In the evening the bāzār had arrangements for lamp lights.[5]

The ganj usually was the market for grains.[6] It was a walled enclosure which was also used for storing the grain.[7] Sometimes it represented the entire pūra (or Mahalla) and took the name of the founder. In a city there could be more than

---

1. Waqāi'-i Ajmer, I, p.68.

2. Haft Iqlīm, I, p.86; Mir'āt (Suppl.), pp. 6-7. For a variety of things sold in the bāzār at Āgra, see Mundy, II, p.216; for Lāhore, see Manrique, II, pp.186-187; for Delhi see Guldasta-i Sultanat~~e~~, op.cit., for Fatehpur Sikri, Monserrate, p.31; for Sūrat, Fryer, I, p.248; for Ahmadābād, P.D.Valle, I, p.96.

3. EF (1678-84), p.270.
4. For example, the main markets at Delhi were known after two chauks i.e. Chāndanī Chauk and Chauk Sa'dullāh Khān.

5. See Qawā'id-i Sultanat-i Shāhjahānī, f.21; Manrique, II, pp. 186-187.

6. Mundy, II, p.207. At Delhi Shādara, Pahārganj and Fatehpurī were principal grain markets, see G.M.Khān, Travels in Upper Hindūstān, GOL Ethe 664, ff.39b, 41b, quoted by H.K.Naqvi, p.76 ~~&~~4 in case of last two. For Shādara, see Siyār-ul Mutaākhirīn, IV, p.31. Tājgang near Tāj at Āgra. See EF (1646-50), p.220 & n1; also at Āgra Mubārak Sultān ganj, Dhoria Ganj and Fatehganj were grain markets, see Ahwāl, ff. 42, 55, 56ab.
7. Bahār-i 'Ajam, II, p.357.

one ganj.[1] The principal ganj was known as shāh-ganj (or ganj-i sarkārī) i.e. the Imperial ganj, supervised by administrators and tax-collectors who were government officials[2] and included in the Khālisa.[3] Contrary to this, the several other ganjs referred to in the sources are said to have been established by the jāgīrdārs during their tenure of jāgīrdārī of a particular qasba. The ganj-i shāhī appears to have been a permanent market while those of jāgīrdārs are mentioned as very flourishing at the cost of Imperial ganj. But after the transfer of the jāgīrdār in most cases, his ganj would decay, or its name was changed by his successor, or, again, it was abandoned completely if the latter chose to establish his own ganj at some other place.[4] For the management and collection of taxes the jāgīrdārs had their own gumāshtas (agents).[5]

---

1. At Ahmadābād, several pūras were prefixed or suffixed by the ward ganj and they were called after the names of their founders such as Wahāb ganj founded by the chief qāzī Abdul Wahāb in the reign of Aurangzeb. Murād ganj founded by Prince Murād etc., See Mirāt (Suppl.), pp. 13, 14, 15. Similarly at Sūrat Wahāb ganj, Bahādurganj and Nūrganj etc. took the names of their founders, See MS. Fraser 124, ff. 124a, 125a. For A'zamganj at Huglī founded by A'zam Shāh during his sūbahdārī of Bengal, See Tārīkh-i-Bangāla, f. 13b;
2. See Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan, document No. 2130, dated 10th Rabī II, 1130 A.H. for Shāh ganj or Ganj-i-Sarkārī.
3. Ibid.
4. Vakil Report, Bundle No. 3, document No. 249, dated 20th Sha'bān 1102 A.H.; Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan, document No. 2152, dated 19th Jumada II, 1130 A.H.; Ibid., document No. 2404, undated.
5. Ibid.

The *Katra* was the market attached to a noble's palace or within the walls built by him.[1] The names of many a *Katras* occur in the sources. Some of them carried the name of their founders,[2] while others were known after the name of a commodity either manufactured or sold there or both.[3] Since most of the *Katras* were associated with the names of the principal nobles, it appears that originally a *katra* contained a few shops near or around or within the nobles enslosure for supplying provisions ready at hand and it was only in the course of time that from a few shops it developed into a mart or suburb.[4] Except in a few cases, the commodities

---

1. See Wilson, p.260; Irvine, *The Army*, I, p.126; see also *Shamsābād Document* (IV), 33, History Department, A.M.U. 'Aligarh. In the above document, a Katra is mentioned at Rashīdābād established by one Rashīd Khān 'Ālamgīrī near his palatial enclosure and around a tank. In an other document, which is a *Tamliknāma* dated 20th Muharram 1040 A.H., the Katra comprising the residential quarters and few shops and garden is mentioned at qasba Sultānpūr. See *Farāmin-i Salātin*, p.53.

2. At Āgra Katra (or Katla) Perwez founded by Prince Perwez. See *'Ardhā'Kathānak*, p.35; Moti Katla, *Ibid.*, p.43, At Agra also, for katra Āghā Baqar, Katra I'tibār Khān, Katra Shā'ista Khān and Katra Mardān Khān etc. See *Ahwāl*, ff. 53-55 ab. At Delhi for Katra Fidā'i Khān, see *Balvantnāma*, f.77a; At Lāhore there was a Katra situated within the chauk of Dārā comprising many houses. See Muhd. Baqar, *Lāhore Past and Present*, p.303.

3. For Katra known after the commodity such as at Delhi; Nil Katra. See G. Muhammad Khān, f.39a. At Āgra Sābūn, Katra, *Ahwāl*, f.55. At Benāras, Katra-i-resum. See *Balvant nāma*, f.136ab.

4. The Katrapārcha at Ahmadābād was situated in the Kotha of Wahābganj. Before its establishment, Wahābganj (founded by Qāzī 'Abdul Wahāb as noted earlier) only contained few shops. The son of the above qāzī, named Muhd. Jamāl when held the Katrapārcha in assignment, he, in order to increase the prosperity of the above pūra (Wahābganj), re-established the katrāparcha there and so arranged that the variety of aromatic roots, drugs and other imports from the port of Sūrat were sold there excise duty free. This enabled the above pūra and the katrapārcha to spring up into a great mart (*Mirāt*, (Suppl.) pp. 14-15).

generally sold in these *katras* are not known. At *katra pārcha* at Aḥmadābād, which was a great market and a fiscal division for custom collection,[1] for example, cloth yarn, hides and a variety of drugs imported from the port of Sūrat used to be sold.[2] The *katra pārcha* existed at Delhi and Sūrat and probably in other big cities also.[3]

The *mandī*, according to the *Mirāt*, was "a place where commodities and corn were brought from outside for sale in the city."[4] Usually a *mandī* was named after the chief commodity sold there,[5] or/after its the *pura* or the *ganj* where it was established.[6] Sometimes a *mandī* was also known after a particular profession or craft played there.[7] There could be

1. *Ibid.*, p. 181.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
3. For Katra pārcha at Burhānpūr, see *Khulāsatul Hind*, p.95.
4. *Mirāt*, (Suppl.), p.182.
5. For the mandīs known after the commodities sold there, for example, the Ghallamandī, almost in every city or town; mandī-i-Chūb (market for wood), see *Nigārnāma-i-Munshī*, f. 249a; Sakkar mandī, *Akhbārāt*, document No.1382, dated 21st safar, 24th year of Aurangzeb; Dālmandī, Hing kī Mandī, See *Aḥwāl*, ff.58a, 55b; Sabzī mandī, *Dastūr*, B.A.Add. 22831, f.24a; mandī-i-Namak at Lāhore, see Irvine, *The Army*, I, p.317. For Kapās mandī, Rogan mandī and Ghalla mandī at Sūrat, see MS. Fraser, 124, f.98a; for Kapāsmandī and Rogan mandī at Cambay, *Ibid.*, f.94a.
6. For mandīs known after the pura or ganj, see at Burhānpūr Shāhganj mandī, Zainābād mandī and Charmina mandī etc. *Dastūr*, B.M.Add. 22831, f.24a; see also *Khulāsatul Hind*, pp. 127-128.
7. For example, at Āgra Hajjām mandī or Nāi kī mandī (barber's lane) see *Aḥwāl*, f.53.

a number of *mandis* in a city and in each a separate commodity used to be sold.[1] An other feature of the *mandis* was that here the commodities were sold and purchased in stock (*thok*) and not in retail.[2]

The *dariba* was a short lane or street.[3] In the sources it has been coupled with *pān*. The *daribapān* (or *pāndariba*) meant a street, stalls or market where betel leaves (*barg tambūl*) were sold.[4] During our period the *daribapān* existed almost in every city.[5] At Ahmadābād, according to the *Mirāt* *daribapān* in itself constituted a *mahāl* which for the collection of government dues was placed under the supervision of the *Kotwālī*.[6] For general administration, it had similar officials as mentioned in connection with the other *mahāls* of that city.[7] Its annual income was Rs. 2,850 (or 1,14,000 *dāms*).[8]

---

1. At Ahmadābād there were 19 mandis, *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.182.

2. Ibid., PP. 166-167.

3. Dariba is derived from an Arabic word darb which means a lane, street, road, path and a narrow lane between two mountains. See *Lisān al 'Arab*, pp. 374-375; Steingass, p. 508.

4. *Mirāt* (Suppl.) p.183. In *Waqā'i-i-Ajmer*, besides the pāndariba, the Kāsadariba (lane or street where cups, plates and utensils of brass etc. were manufactured or sold) and the Anjiradariba (street for spices and herbs) are also mentioned. *Waqā'i-i Ajmer*, II, pp. 474, 475, 476.

5. Chewing of betel-leaf was very common. Mundy, II, p.96; P.Della Valle, II, p.226; *Bahāristān Ghabi*, I, p.140; *EF (1618-21)*, p.317; *Ibid* (1622-23), p.73; Ibid., p.75; *Letters Received*, VI, p.204.

6. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.183.

7. *Ibid*.

8. *Ibid*.

We do not know whether similar arrangements also existed in other cities.

The nakhāsa was a daily market where cattle, horses, camels, oxen, goats, pigeons etc., and slaves were sold both wholesale and retail.[1] At Āgra, it was held in a covered building known as 'Imārat-i nakhāsa daily in the morning, and according to Pelsaert, in addition to cattles, "tents, cotton goods and many other things were sold."[2] At Ahmadābād it together with path, as mentioned elsewhere, constituted a separate mahāl and formed part of mahāl sāir.[3] The officials and market dues were the same as in other mahāls.[4] The Mirāt mentions that at Ahmadābād nakhāsa the government used to purchase Cutch horses.[5]

The path (hāt) was a market held at a fixed place around the city or at villages of note on fixed days - once a week

---

1. Mundy, II, p.189; Pelsaert, p.4; De laet, p.70; see also 'Bahār-i-Ālam,' II, p.442.

2. Pelsaert, p.4; At Patna also, the nakhāsa was organised in an enclosed place, Akhbarnāma, III, p.82; Ardhā Kathānak pp. 36,44; De laet, 40; Ahwāl-i Shahar Akhbarābād, f.56; At Lāhore also nakhāsa was held in a building, see Md. Baqar, Lahore Past and Present, p.304. For nakhāsa at Delhi, see Sujān Rāi, pp. 5-6.

3. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.182.

4. Ibid., pp. 182-183.

5. Ibid., p. 184.

or twice a week.[1] It was an assemblage of petty banias local manufacturers (or artisans) and professionals who gathered from the adjoining towns and the country around[2] in the morning, and the hāt (market) continued till a little before sun-set.[3] Here things of daily necessity, food stuffs, oil, ghī (butter), goods such as cloth, thread, cotton, indigo, sugar, rice were sold and purchased.[4] In some peths however, the sale and purchase of cattle such as horse, camels, bullock etc. is said to have taken place.[5] In the peths all those who brought their commodities to be sold had stalls on the ground and in the open.[6] At Ahmadābād according to the Mirāt, the path and the nakhāsa were held together.[7]

---

1. Around Satagāon the peth was held once week. See Caesar Frederick, p.114. Around Hugli it was thrice a week. See Master, I, p.325. At Āgra daily. Ardha Kathānak, p.19. Fitch, Early Travels, p.26. Thrice a week at Merta (sūba Ajmer). See Jaseph Salbanche, p.84. At Lakhawār (near Patna) daily. See EF (1618-21), p.192.
2. Akhbārāt, document No.2946, dated 10th Zilqada, 29th year of Aurangzeb; EF (1618-21), p.192.
3. Selected Waqāi, p.86; Selected Document (Shāhjahān) p.118.
4. At Lakhavār the principal commodity was calicoes and diverse type of cotton clothes manufactured in the adjoining areas and brought to be sold by the weavers themselves. See EF (1618-21), p.192. See also Selected Waqāi, p.86; Selected Document (Shāhjahān), p.118, for cotton clothes being sold in peths.
5. See Waqāi-i-Ajmer, I, p.231, for the peth at Pahlodi village near Marta where besides victuals and commodities of general use, horse, camel and bullocks used to be sold and purchased.
6. EF (1618-21), p.138.
7. See the sources cited for nakhāsa, p.186 n.3.

From the Travellers we learn of an other type of market i.e. seasonal or temporary bāzārs held at the port towns of Sūrat, Huglī, Satagāon etc.[1] Mundy gives a vivid description of the one established at Swālly as follows: "heare is a great bāzār, made by Baniānas of bambooes, reeds etts., where all manner of necessaries and commodities are to be had. Also provision, especially toddy, which finds current and quick dispatch. The said bāzāres as soon as the shipps make way to be gon is sett on fire."[2] At Swālly this market was assembled between September and January the time for the arrival and departure of the ships.[3] These bāzārs catered to the needs of those waiting for the arrival and departure of the ships [illegible]. We are not expressly told as to who controlled these bāzārs and how or how much was realised on account of government dues. It

---

1. Mundy, II, pp.312-313; The Principal Voyages of the English Nation, 'Observations' of M. Caesar Frederick, Vol. III, p.236; Master, I, p.325.

2. Mundy, II, pp. 312-313; Herbert, pp. 37-38. A similar description of another organised at Satagāon is given by M. Caesar Frederick thus : "Every year at Butter (a village near Satagaon) they make and unmake a village, with houses and shoppes made of strawe, and with all things necessarie to their uses, and this village standeth as long as the ships ride there, and till they depart for the Indies, and when they are departed, every man goeth to his plot of houses, and there setheth fire on them." See The Principal Voyages, op.cit.

3. EF (1655-60), p.315.

appears however that the muqaddam of Swālly, who was a permanent resident and an agent of the government, exercised supervision over the bāzār there on behalf of the mutasaddī of Sūrat.[1]

The fairs used to be held once a year[2] or at intervals[3] at a place or places which had religious sanctity for being associated with some deity or for lying on the bank of holy river.[4] Thousands and thousands of devotees annually gathered there to perform their rites in the name of the deity either by taking dips into a tank or river or by offering worship on a fixed day or days together.[5] At the fair, the installation of a temporary market was customary, where local merchants,

---

1. Thomas Best, p.246. For muqaddam of Swally at immediate orders of the Mutasaddī of Sūrat, see, Pieter Van Den Broeke, p.218.

2. For the annual fair at Pushkar village near Ajmer, see Waqā'i Ajmer, I, pp.40-41; and Ibid., p.286 for a similar fair near Jodhpūr. The méla of the Ganges at Garh Mukhtéswar, see Chahār Gulshan, f.38ab. At Kurukshetra the méla on the eve of the solar eclipse. Ibid., f.36b.

3. Kumbh méla at Hardwar every fifth year, Ibid., f.38b. For Magh méla at Allāhābād, see Sujān Rāi, p.41.

4. The towns situated on the bank of Ganges were considered sacred and for that reason the annual fairs used to be held there. For references see Chapter I, p 13n.1.

5. At Kurukshetra the main fair was held for one day. At Pushkar the méla held for 20 years. At Garh Mukhtéswar the fair lasted 15 days. The Mugh fair at Allāhābād lasting for one month. See sources quoted above in fns. 2 & 3.

manufacturers and hawkers put up their stalls and sold a variety of things from victuals to mercantile goods and curiosities to the large gathering assembled there.[1] From such fairs, the government used to charge from devotees small sums for taking dips in the tank or river and levied dues on sale and purchase.[2] The government could collect the above levy either directly through its officials or it could farm out the income from the fair.[3]

MARKET DAYS:

The market was held twice a day, first in the morning after sunrise, and then in the evening. At noon, the shopkeepers closed their shops and rested in the houses.[4] Two days in a week were holidays, i.e. Thursday for the Baniās and Friday for the Muslims.[5] The Hindu shopkeepers in Gujarāt also

---

1. For various commodities, victuals and curiosities sold in the fairs, see Pelsaert, p.72; Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 40-41.

2. At Pushkar ~~the~~ méla about one thousand rupees used to collected by the government, Ibid.

3. The income from the méla held at Kāparhera, near Jodhpūr, was formed out to the muqaddam of the above village for Rs. 1,700; Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, p.285.

4. Terry, Early Travels, p.313.

5. Ibid., p. 325.

kept shops closed on days of Puranmāshī, Amābasiyā and Aykādashī.[1] The festivals of Holī and Īd were also observed as holidays.[2]

HARTĀL:

A sudden news of the death of a big merchant or an unwanted happening could lead to the closure of the shops.[3] Besides this, we read of hartāl being observed in protest against oppression by local officials.[4]

PANCHĀYAT:

There are references to merchant guilds or bāzār panchāyats also known as 'mahegar' (or 'mahajan') headed by a big merchant.[5] They were to look after the interests of fellow businessmen. These panchāyats at times used to take important decisions with regard to the rules and regulations of the market and co-operated with the local town administration.[6]

---

1. Mirāt, I, p.260.
2. EF (1622-23), p.93.
3. Akhbārāt, document No.1308, 7th Jumāda II, 24th year Alamgīrī;
4. Ibid., dated 11th Jumāda I, 49th year of Aurangzeb; Ibid., document No.675, dated 11th Jumāda II, 49th year of Aurangzeb.
5. For guild or panchāyat, see EF (1670-77) pp. 80-81. For panchāyat-i bāzār, see the document No. XIII, The Mughal Emperors and the Jogis of Jakhbār, p.157. For Mahoger or Mahajan, See EF (1668-69), pp. 180-192.
6. Ibid.

At the call of this body, the entire market business could come to a standstill.[1]

MARKET ADMINISTRATION:

The mutasaddis were clerks appointed at the recommendation of the dīwān[2] and attached to markets and toll stations (nākas).[3] They issued permits to those who wished to bring their merchandise into the city for sale, and recorded dues payable on various articles.[4] Similar passes also were to be issued whenever the goods were carried out from the city.[5] Nothing in fact could go out of the city unless the Chhitthī-i rukhsat (pass) was delivered by the mutasaddī and the packages outward bound were stamped by him to certify that the mahsūl had been paid.[6]

The daily account of the market, which included the Kāghaz-i nirākh (prices),[7] the siyāha-i kharīd o firūkht

---

1. Ibid.; Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, p.199.
2. Vakīl Report, Bundle No.8, document No.161, dated 21st Sha'bān, 32 year of Aurangzeb.
3. Mirāt (Suppl.), pp. 180-181.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., pp. 181,194.
7. Kāghazāt-i Mutafarriq, f. 60a.

(the register of sale and purchase)[1] and the income to the government[2] and bearing the signatures of the dārogha, waqā'i-navis, chaudharī and muqim, was submitted to the mutasaddī for examination.[3] From the mutasaddī the above papers were sent to the dīwān or the nāzim for inspection.[4]

The mutasaddīs had instructions to see that the prices of grain were kept low in the market and they were held answerable in case of high price (girānī).[5] Through a large number of official orders, they were from time to time warned not to harass the merchants on account of illegal exactions nor to allow others to do the same.[6] The mutasaddīs were enjoined to help in the collection of taxes.[7]

---

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
3. Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, f. 60a.
4. Ibid.
5. Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, f. 60a.
6. Akhbārāt, document No.2360, dated 25th Sha'bān, 27th year of Aurangzeb; Ibid, document No.1592, dated 10 Rajab 5 year of Bahādurshāh; Ibid, document No.3317, dated 14th Shawwāl, 39th year of Aurangzeb; Vakīl Report, Bundle No.4, document No. 608, dated 3rd Shawwāl, 1106 A.H.
7. Ibid., Bundle No.8, document No. 161, dated 21st Sha'bān, 32 year of Aurangzeb.

The *nigāhbānān* and the *piyādas* are said to have been appointed in all the markets. According to the *Akbarnāma*, Akbar in the 27th year appointed several market inspectors to check oppression and irregularities in buying, selling, weighting, measuring and pricing the commodities in the market of Āgra.[1] The sources tell us nothing about the regular appointment of the market inspectors in other cities. However, the posting of *piyādas* under the supervision of *Kotwāl* or *Muhtasib* to keep watch and ward over the markets appears to be a constant feature.[2] Besides preventing irregularities, it was also the duty of the *piyādas* to induce the traders and consumers to make sale and purchase at *Shāh-ganj* (or the *ganj* established by the government).[3] The house-to-house sale often adopted by traders, with the view to evade the market dues, was discouraged.[4] The merchants and shopkeepers were required to sit in *mandīs* or

---

1. The market inspectors appointed by Akbar were: Muhd. Khān [redacted] to inspect the sale and purchase of horses; Rāja Todar Mal of elephants and grain market; Zain Khān Koka of oil; Shāh Qulī Khān Mahram of fruit and sweetments; Sādiq Khān of gold and silver; I'timād K. Gujarātī of jewels; Shāhbāz Khān of gold brocade; M. Yūsuf of camels; Sharīf Khān of sheep and goats; Ghāzī K. Badukhshi of salt; Makhsūs Khān of armour; Qāsim Khān of aromatics; Hakīm Abūl Fath of intoxicants; Khwāja 'Abdus Samad of leathern articles; Naurang Khān of dyes, Rāja Birbal of cattle and buffaloes; S. Jamāl of drugs; Naqīb Khān of books; Habībullāh of sugar and Abūl Fazl of woollens, *Akbarnāma*, III, p.396.

2. See *Mutafarriq Mahsrāigan*, Bundle No. 21, document No. 212 dated 11th Ramzan 1105 A.H.

3. *Ibid*.

4. *Ibid*.

ganis and to keep shops open so that whatever was brought to be sold did not evade the collectors of market duties.[1]

The chaudharī was the head of traders in each bāzār selected from amongst the merchants and recognised by the government.[2] The mutasaddī of the bāzār instead of dealing with a number of merchants individually or jointly had to deal with one man with regard to the management of the bāzār and to help to enforce the mercantile law.[3] His duties were to see that weights were uniform and conformed to the fixed standards, and that none of the traders weighed less and enhanced the prices unilaterally.[4] Sometimes his help was also sought to settle a bargain or to fix prices.[5] In one sanad, he is instructed to endeavour to create an amicable

---

1. Ibid.

2. Vakīl Report, Bundle No.8, document No.121, dated 31st year 'Ālamgīrī; Mundy, II, p.147; Akhbārāt, 11th Muharram 20th year 'Ālamgīrī. According to the Mirāt the Chaudharīs in the markets for various commodities were appointed by the Kotwāl, Mirāt, I, p.169.

3. Khwāja Yāsīn, f. 58ab.

4. Ibid; Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, p.58b. The Chaudharī was required to keep an eye on prices. According to one report from Mathura, muchalka was taken from the Chaudharī of the grain market that he would stablize the price of wheat at 25 sers per rupee. See Akhbārāt document No. 3318, dated 7th Zīlqāda, 39th year 'Ālamgīrī.

5. Mundy, II, p.147.

atmosphere in the bāzār so that the traders come in large number and add to the income of the bāzār day after day.[1] He also helped the officials in the collection of maḥsūl-i bāzār.[2] We do not know what exactly his perquisites were. His appointment however, appears to be of a semi-official nature. For, on being chosen, a sanad was issued in his name,[3] and in return he had to execute a written bond assuring to work honestly.[4] Among the artisans, tradesmen and urban professionals of the bāzār too, similar chaudharis existed, in each bāzār of a city.[5]

There used to be weighmen in markets. It was customary that whenever a commodity or corn etc. were sold, the buyer or the seller engaged a third man who had no personal interest in the commodity purchased or sold to weigh the goods sold. For this, he received a customary perquisite known as tolāī (or biyāī) amounting to a handful of grain given by the buyer when grain was sold and weighed. In the sources there are references of tolāī or the weighman's

---

1. Farāmin-i Salātin, p. 103.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., pp. 76-77, 103; Mutafarriq Mahārājgan, Bundle No.2. document No. 332, dated 28th Safar 49th year 'Ālamgīr.
4. See Waqāi'-i Ajmer, II, p.640.
5. Khwāja Yāsin, op.cit.

perquisite of a mandī or ganj (or bāzār) being farmed out to a person. The weighman was not a government official. Any body, if allowed by the government, could be a weighman.[1]

The palledār was the porter. He was engaged to carry grain and other commodities from the mandī to the house of consumer or from one bāzār to another.[2] Their number in towns and cities was quite large; for example, in Mathura it was 150.[3] We do not known how they were paid.

The sweepers do not appear to have been government employees like the municipal workers of the present day. For sweeping the markets they charged something from the shop-keepers and in return out of the above income paid a tax known as dastūr-i mihtarāī (sweeping fee).[4]

---

1. See the dastak, bearing the seal of Isahāq A'zam Khān-i-Khān a servant of Shāhjahān, dated 1053 A.H. (A.D.), addressed to the mutasaddī pargana Mahāban, sarkār & sūba Āgra, with regard to a grain mandī at qasba Gokul where the men of Vithāl rāi had endowments granted by Akbar. According to the dastak, the men of Vithāl rāi since long had the right of receiving the weighing perquisites of the above mandī. But in the year noted above one Nathu petitioned that if the right of weighing perquisites were farmed out to him he would pay to the government Rs.175 annually. But the men of Vithāl rāi represented that the above Nathu wanted to set up a shop in the mandī and if the right of receiving tolāī was granted to him he would add to the difficulties of the traders and would cause to the stop-page of their visits to the mandī; the loss thereby would ultimately be that of Vithālrāi. Thereupon, the petition of Nāthu was set aside. For the dastak, see K.M. Jhaveri, pp. 26-27; Wilson, p.48.
2. Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan, Bundle No.4, document No.768, dated 39th year Ālamgiri.
3. Ibid.
4. Mirāt, I, p.287. However, the above tax was included in the list of prohibited casses under Aurangzeb.

For the collection of custom dues (see Chapter V), the various type of markets referred above could either be kept in Khālisa or given in assignment, or farmed out. According to one Vakīl Report, Rāja Rām Singh, on being appointed the thānadār of Jamrūd (sūba Kābul), took on ijāra, the collection of custom dues (mahsūl) of Ganj-i Jamrūd and the transit duty (rāhdāri) of the area around the above thāna. Through his Vakīl, Kanwal Nain, he was given to understand that he would refrain from oppressing and harassing the traders and travellers by collection of prohibited taxes. He, however, could collect what was legally due. He was also instructed not to let any one pass without a proper dastak.[1] A similar ijāra for the collection of mahsūl-i path held at Pahlodi - a village near Merta (sūba Ajmer), was farmed out for Rs. 15,000 a year. This path was very big and was held once a week.[2]

DALLĀL:

The market organisation discussed above necessiated the presence of a dallāl (broker or middleman)[3] in each

---

1. Vakīl Report, Bundle No. 4 document No.42, dated 24th Shawwāl 1093 A.H.

2. Waqāi-i-Ajmer, I, p.231.

3. The persian historians knew the middleman, who acted between buyer and seller; between merchant and producer, as dallāl and muqim. The Europeans called him broker. While locally he had been named as arhatiyā. For arhatiyā, see EF (1618-21), p.85; Tavernier stressed that every

Contd.....

market for various commodities.[1] He sat in the *bāzār* and helped to fix the prices between the buyer and the seller through inducing the two to agree to a bargain.[2] There could be more than one in each *bāzār*. He was never a paid employee of the government but a commissioned agent who, however, required a formal *dastak* to be issued in his name for the installation of his agency.[3] In return he had to execute a bond to assure impartiality in his dealings in the market.[4] According to both the *Āīn*[5] and the *Mirāt*[6], the brokers in the markets for various commodities were to be appointed by the *Kotwāl* to whom they were to submit the *roznāmcha* (diary) prepared by them, and

---

(Continued from the previous page)

European having any business in India had to have dealing with the broker. Tavernier, I, pp. 77-78. He elsewhere insisted on the necessity of a native broker who should be from amongst the Hindus. II, p.38; Fitch, *Early Travels*, p.35. Ovington mentioned that, "for the buying and more advantagious disposing of the Companys goods, there are brokers appointed, who are of the Banian cast, skilled in the rates and values of all the commodities in India"; Ovington, p.233. Fryer wrote that nothing could be done without the brokers. Fryer, I, p.212; Master, II, p.14; *EF (1668-69)*, p.196. For a detailed observation of M. Caesar Frederick on the work of dallāls at Cambay port, see *The Principal Voyages of the English Nation*, III, pp.206, 207, 208.

1. *Mirāt*, I, p.169.
2. *Ibid*, (Suppl.), p.180; *Kāghazāt Mutafarriq*, ff.4b, 5a.
3. *Nigārnāma-i-Munshi*, ff. 248ab, 249a, 254b, 255a; *Khāghazāt Mutafarriq*, f. 58b.
4. *Nigārnāma-i-Munshi*, op.cit.
5. *Āīn*, I, p.284.
6. *Mirāt*, I, p.169.

containing a record of all purchase and sale transanctions, market rates for each commodity sold and other related matters.[1] For his work the broker was paid a commission amounting from annas 12 per hundred[2] to Rs. 2%[3] charged both from the seller and the buyer. Of this, according to the Mirāt, he had to pay Rs. 1000 annually to the government on account of peshkash.[4] Although the brokers were required to work with impartiality, the general complaint against them was that they were in collaboration with the native merchants, and lowered or enhanced the market rates to the disadvantage of the peasant, artisan and the foreigners.[5] The peasant and artisan, in view of their inadequate knowledge of the day-to-day market were to a great extent at the mercy of the broker; while the Europeans to whom the local market's code language was a problem, could also not fully guard themselves against the brokers duplicity.[6]

---

1. Mirāt, I, p.169.
2. Ibid, (Suppl.), p.180.
3. In jewellry bāzār, however, the dallāl charged two per cent i.e. 1% from the seller and 1% from the buyer. See Mirāt, I, pp. 214-215.
4. Ibid., (Suppl.), p.180.
5. Tavernier, II, p.183; Thevenot, pp. 77-78; Ovington, p.233.
6. There are large number of complaints in the English Factors despatches that they were subject to prejudice in settling the prices, cheating in weighing, delay of payment and several other tricks in their dealings with the local market people. The main reason was the problem of language which they did not understand, see EF (1634-36), pp.143, 156, 272.

PRICE CONTROL:

We do not hear of any attempt made by the town administration to create machinery for controlling prices. The price reports were regularly prepared for each market from all parts of the empire by the waqāinavis.[1] The nirkhnāma (price list) and Siyāha-i kharīd-o firūkht (the register of purchase and sale) prepared by the nirkhnavis[2] and having been signed by the dārogha, the amīn, the mushrif, the karora, the qānūngo, the chaudharī, the muqīm and the waqāi' used to be submitted almost daily first to the mutasaddi and thereafter to the dīwān or the nāzim.[3] So that the government could be kept informed about the price changes. Muchalkas from these officials were taken to organise a constant supply and not to harass the merchants by extorting illegal dues which forced up the prices.[4] The chaudharī and the dallāl were also made to execute bonds that they would always endeavour to keep the prices at proper rates.[5]

---

1. Selected Waqāi', pp. 32-46, 63-64, 75-77.

2. Siyāqnāma, 89.

3. Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, f. 60a.

4. See the references cited for various officials who had administrative responsibilities in the town, Chapters, II, III, and IV.

5. For muchalka from chaudhari, see Farāmīn-i salātīn, pp.76-77 103; Mutafarriq Maharajgan, Bundle No.2, document No.332, dated 28th Safar, 49th year 'Alamgiri. For similar muchalka from the dallāl, see the references cited above for dallal.

As mentioned in an earlier chapter, one of the important duties of the Kotwāl was the supervision of markets.[1] He was required to endeavour to ensure low prices, and regular supply; to prevent people from purchasing in bulk from sarvans outside the city, to discourage hoarding and to suppress engrossing. Further, he was instructed to keep himself informed of the day-to-day market rates.[2] He used to appoint the chaudharī and dallāl in various markets and received from them the roznāmcha (diary) from each market.[3] He was also to prohibit the collection of forbidden cesses charged from those who brought their commodities to the town.[4]

The muhtasib was also called upon to perform almost similar duties. It was, for example, a part of his daily routine to collect information about market rates, to get the schedule of rates settled at chabūtra-i-kotwālī and to compel traders to show to him the commodities brought by them from outside. Sometimes in order to supervise the above work more vigrously, the muhtasib, in addition to his own duties, also held the post of nirākhnavīsī of bāzārs.[5]

---

1. See Chapter II, pp 59-61.

2. See Āīn, I, p.284; Mirāt, I, pp.169-170; Dastūr-i-Jahān Kushāī, f. 86a.

3. Mirāt, I, p.169.

4. Āīn, op.cit.; Mirāt, op.cit., p.3.

5. See Chapter III, Section on Muhtasib, p. 112.

Many of the instructions to the Kotwāl, the muhtasib and other town officials were merely theoretical exercises. In practice things were otherwise. In theory, the exaction of the abwāb was a punishable crime and their realization was repeatedly forbidden through royal mandates issued by successive Mughal rulers.[1] However, in practice, they were collected throughout the empire by almost all local officials, jāgīrdārs[2] and chiefs.[3] It was not the drought alone which could have crushing effect over the supply, the levy and realization of prohibited cesses had also an effective role to play in this regard. The general complaint in the contemporary literature was that owing to the imposition of large number of illegal taxes, the free flow of corn and other commodities was obstructed and consequently the prices went up substantially.[4] In a news report from Delhi, it was reported

---

1. For the abolition of illegal taxes by the Mughal rulers. See Āīn, I, pp. 294-301; Tuzuk, p.4; Mirāt, I, pp.286-287; Zawābit-i-Ālamgīrī, f.135; Dastūral 'amal, p.90b, No.370, f.107; Khāfī Khān, II, p.88.
2. For the collection of prohibited cesses and imposts see Chapter II, pp.81-85.
3. For the imposts levied and realized perforce by the tributary chiefs, see Tavernier, I, p.31; EF (1646-50), pp. 192-193; Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, pp. 281-282.
4. See Ālamgīrnāma, pp. 436, 437, 438; Khāfī Khān, II, pp.87, 88, 89, 212; Mirāt, I, pp. 262-266; Akhbārāt, document No.2451, dated 27 Zilhijja 28th year; Ibid, document No. 3317, dated 14th Shawwāl. 39th year; Ibid, document No.2360 25th Sha'bān, 27th year; Ibid., document No. 3318, 8th Zilqada, 39th year all Ālamgīrī; Waqā'i-i-Ajmer, I, p.326; Khutūt-i-Mahārājgan, document No. 3007 undated; Ibid., document No. 2076, dated 26 Zilqada 1129 A.H.

that *ghi* (butter), grain and other commodities were very dear in the city because the *mutasaddi* there used to collect at illegal rates.[1] In a similar despatch from Agra it was mentioned that the merchants for fear of *abwab-i mamnūʿa* which were realized in and around the city, abstained from bringing the corn to the city; and therefore the grain was sold very dear. Thereupon, a warning was issued to the *thānadārs* and the *mutasaddi* not to harass the merchants.[2]

Besides natural fluctuations in supply and illegal taxes, the other factors which obstructed the control of prices were monopoly and engrossing (*ihtikār*) practised both by high officials of the state and the big merchants. In theory both the above practices were denounced by moralists[3] and prohibited through royal orders;[4] but in practice monopolies were established on a large scale not only by officials[5] but

---

1. *Akhbārāt*, document No.1692, 10th Rajab 5th year Bahādur Shāh.

2. *Ibid.*, document No.3317, dated 14th Shawwāl, 39th year of ʿĀlamgīrī.

3. *Āʾīn*, I, p.291.

4. *Inshā-i Abūl Fazl*, p.65; *Mirʾāt*, I, pp. 169-70; *Āʾīn*, I, p. 284.

5. Monopoly trade carried on very extensively by nobles and officials is a well known fact. There are large number of complaints against Shāʾista Khān for monopolizing the salt-petre and salt markets. The English Factors from Patna wrote to Sūrat (1664) that, "Shāʾista Khān's intentions were to get this whole trade of peeter in his own hands, and so to sell it again to us and the Dutch at his own rates,

Contd......

at times also by the emperors.[1] Large number of officials both high and low figure in the sources as buyers and sellers in the mandis or ganjs. They themselves used to fix the prices of the commodities which they purchased and sold.[2] None could dare sell till the stock of an official was not sold.[3] It was said of Shāista Khān that if per chance any

---

(Continued from the previous page)

he well knowing that ships cannot goe from the Bay empty." EF (1661-64), pp.395, 396,399,401,402-403. Mīr Jumla during his Viceroyalty of Bengāl is reported to have monopolized almost all the commodities of that province, see EF (1661-64) p.149. In an other English Factors letters from Huglī dated 9th June 1661, it was mentionedthat Mirzā Lūtfullāh Beg, diwān at Patna has monopolized the sale of saltpetre and forced the dealers to deliver their saltpetre to him alone regardless of their contracts with the Dutch, Ibid, pp. 69-71. The mutasaddi of Sūrat monopolized the lead market of the above port, see EF (1630-33) pp. 216, 304, 323.

1. The textile fabric known as tapestry at Lāhore was the monopoly of Emperor Shāh Jahān EF (1624-29), p.95. Bees-wax and salt around Chittagong, Dacca and Huglī were monopolized by Aurangzeb. Master, I,pp.15,321. For Saltpetre at Patna, see EF (1661-64), pp.69-71; and for Indigo monopoly both of Biāna and Sarkhej and its farming out in 1633, see Ibid., (1630-33), pp. 324,328; Ibid,(1634-36),pp.I,70,73.

2. See the evidence cited above for monopoly trade.

3. EF (1622-23) p.230. The English Factors at Ahmadābād reported to his counterpart at Sūrat (1622) that, the governor of Dholka, because he wanted to dispose of his whole stock of indigo to the English, had forbidden all the merchants of the town not to sell their indigo to the English and nor to weigh what the above had already purchased, Ibid., p.173.

of his goods remained unsold "he calls them (merchants) and distributes amongst them what quantity he pleaseth at 10 to 15 per 100 higher than the markets for time."[1] Thus in monopoly, when the buyers and sellers themselves were officials, either on their own behalf or on behalf of the Emperor, town officials could hardly think of regulating them properly. The seller was compelled to sell only to one buyer (or a group of buyers)[2], who, being the sole purchaser, always endeavoured to press down the prices and took every advantage of the poverty and indebtedness of the producer.[3]

In establishing the monopolies by the Emperor or higher nobles, the assistance of the local governors,

1. Master, II, p.80.

2. "In Ahmadābād, its suburbs and the parganas of the said province, says the Mirāt, "some people have monopolized the sale and purchase of rice. No one can sell or buy without their sanction. Owing to this rice bears a high price in Gujarat." Mirāt, I, pp. 260-261.

3. In view of the poverty and indebtedness of the producers, both peasant and artisan had to put to the market no sooner the new harvest came into the hands of the peasant and whatever the artisan manufactured almost daily. Both needed money. The peasant had to pay land revenue and to keep himself alive while the artisan besides his bread had to pay back money to the dādan merchant or the mahājan. They could not wait as the merchant usually used to do. See Letter's Received, VI, p.220. Moreover, the merchant, who had lended money to the producer, used to avail all opportunities of specific occasions and the latters needs for pressing down the prices. The merchants not only kept the producers in bondage for producing goods in accordance of the specifications given before hand by the former but also paid less prices and not at a time. While analysing the economic development in Russia, Lenin has also put forward a similar view in his 'The Development of Capitalism

Contd.....

mutasaddis, faujdār, dīvān , and Kotwāl etc. was utilized.[1] These officials purchased or sold per force in the name of the king and the nobles, rating the commodity to the advantage of their patron, and, in case they purchased anything, avoided payments in cash.[2] While selling, they charged 10,15 or 20 per cent more than the prices current in market and compelled the buyer to pay in cash then and there.[3] Any moment the entire ■ commodity put to the market could be appropriated for purchase by the king of a noble;[4] and if the producer or merchant showed reluctance he could be beaten and imprisoned.[5]

(Continued from the previous page)

Capitalism in Russia', pp. 367-368; see also Pelsaert, pp. 16-17. According to the English Factors, the practice of advancing loans to indigo producers proved very profitable. While the price of indigo at Āgra was Rs.35 to 36½ per maund, the English by advancing money got it only at 24 to 25, EF (1624-29), p.206.

1. EF (1661-64), pp.70-71; Mundy II, p.371; EF (1618-21), p.307.

2. Bee wax at Huglī according to Master once was purchased in the name of the king at the rate of 7 to 12 per maund. But later on it was sold at Rs.19 to 22 per maund. Master II, p.81.
3. Ibid., p.80.
4. Mundy, II, pp. 150-151.

5. The faujdār at Baroda once put the weavers of the city into prison and caused them to be beaten. Their fault, according to the English Factors from the above place, was that they refused to sell their clothes at the rates fixed by the faujdār. See EF (1634-36), p.290.

The officials were also accused of openly practising engrossing. They did not allow others to buy but themselves purchased first at the arrival of a commodity in the markets and having purchased the whole lot they compelled the merchants and others to buy from them. Sometimes whatever was rotten or spoilt out of the commodity engrossed they passed on to the merchants and realized from them the prices at the rate of good ones.[1]

Engrossing, which was a mercantile device, was aimed at two things: first, to purchase the entire stock of a commodity available in the market anticipating or prohibiting any competition,[2] or by enhancing the prices unilaterally

---

1. The private trade of the officials high and low was a great hindrance to the normal course of the prices. They could force the merchants and producers to sale to none but to them and at their prices. They openly practise engrossing and cornering. The Mirāt has us to believe that "the mutasaddis, seths and desais of most parganas (in the province of Ahmadābād) do not allow others to buy the newly harvested grain. They first buy it themselves and whatever be rotten or spoilt they pass on the tradesmen by force and compel them to pay them the prices at the full rates for (good) grain." The same source further adds that, "officers (at Ahmadābād) forced the vegetable dealers to purchase the vegetables and fruits of their gardens and per force realize ten times and twenty times increased prices than the current." Mirāt, I, pp.260-261. In a Madras Agency despatch dated 29th Jan. 1662. Mir Jumal, the then governor of Bengāl, is accused of engrossing almost all the commodities of the above province for his own profit and there by hindering the entire trade of Bengāl. See EF (1661-64) p.67. For the governors intended engrossing of indigo trade at Ahmadābād, see Ibid (1646-50), p.130.
   In 1647, the English Factors from Ahmadābād accused Shaista Khān of becoming "the sole merchant of the above city", the Factors, apprehending the danger from the above

Contd.......

to a point where other competitors would leave the markets;[1] secondly, having purchased the entire supply, to hold it, thereby understocking the market with the intention of becoming the sole supplier and then to sell at double or tripple the prices that were current in the market.[2] In case the market

---

(Continued from the previous page)

Khān, pointed out that if he succeeded in engrossing the indigo "we may then expect shortly to fetch our butter and rice from him. "EF (1646-50), p.130.

2. The best way to avoid a bitter competition for a particular commodity reported the English Factors from Sūrat (1665) .... was "to purchase the whole quantity at its first arrival in the market." EF (1665-67) pp.30-31.

1. A Parsi merchant from Bombay is reported to have purchased the entire cloth put to the market at Broach (1675) and he turned the English out of market. See EF (1670-71) p. 255. See also Ibid (1634-36), p.365, when the English abstained from the market at Broach while a Dutchman (Signor Silvis) made the entire purchase. Still in another instance again at Broach, the French compelled both the English and the Dutch to leave the market and purchased the whole cloth, EF (1678-84), p. 260.

2. EF (1661-64), p.207; Ibid (1678-84), pp. 352-353. If per chance the commodity engrossed remained unsold, how Shāista Khān used to press the merchants at Huglī to buy that per force. Mentioning this Master wrote, "whenever he hath any goods on his hands calls for them (merchants) and distributes amongst them what quantity he pleaseth, at 10 to 15 for 100 higher than the markets for time". Master, II, p.80.

had been cornered by a few it was the majority of the townmen which suffered for paying the high prices.[1]

Thus under the given conditions mentioned above, price control was not possible. It was the conditions of supply and demand, realization of illegal taxes, trade monopoly and engrossing which were the main factors regulating prices.

---

1. "IN 1632 when Sūrat was still famine striken", wrote the English Factors x from the above city", the local prices of food were doubled because the governor and one or two big merchants had combined to engross the available supply of grain." See EF (1630-33), p.209.

CHAPTER VII

THE MINTS

The mints in the Mughal Empire were a source of considerable income to the government. Large sums of money were realized through the charges known as *mahsūl-i dārulzarb* (mint charges). The mint had the twin functions of minting the bullion, (gold or silver) or copper, and reminting the old coins, that had lost value either by age or weight or both. Imported bullion or silver could not find its way into the country except through the mint. Importers of bullion were required to carry it from the custom-house directly to the mint to be coined.[1] It was perhaps for this reason that the more important ports and border towns contained mints.[2] Also as a rule, the government compelled the reminting of old coins by either not normally accepting them in payments to the treasury, or by only doing so at a discount (*batta*).[3] For every year, subsequent to the year of issue recorded on the coin, a percentage was deducted from its value irrespective of the actual loss of weight. A rupee that had been in

---

1. Tavernier, I, pp.8-9; J.Van Twist, pp. 72-73; Hamilton, pp. 335-340; *EF (1642-45)*, p.17.

2. Tavernier, I, p.9; *Ibid.*, II, p.41.

3. See Aurangzeb's *farmān* to Rasikdās Karorī Article 8th, pub. Sarkar, '*Mughal Administration*', p.195.

4. Tavernier, I,p.9; *EF (1634-36)*, p.68. The Factors quoting the rates of *batta* at Sūrat around the year 1634 reported it as 13 or 14 rupees per hundred.

circulation for more than one year lost 3 per cent and after two years of circulation no less than 5 per cent.[1]

There is a list of the mint - towns in the _Āīn-i-Akbarī_. Mints are also recorded in the coins themselves. I have compiled a list of towns that had mints.[2] These mints were theoritically 'commercial' enterprises, it being open to every one to go to a mint and get his bullion and old coins minted into new currency.[3] The multiplicity of mints enabled people throughout the empire to avail of this opportunity, and it probably contributed to the fact that Mughal coinage production could respond easily to quicker inflow of bullion.[4]

---

1. In Master's time in Bengāl, the _Sikka_ carried the premium at ~~sometimes~~ 4,5, or 6 per cent over those struck in the previous years. Master, I, pp.393, n-2. Tavernier however places the loss at ¼ or 1/8 per cent. - Tavernier, I, p.29.

2. The list of active mints during the period 1556 ~~at~~ to 1707 has been arranged in appendix No.I. The mint towns of four Mughal rulers viz. Akbar, Jahāngīr, Shāhjahān and Aurangzeb have been included into the list.

3. _Āīn_, I, pp. 16, 31-33; Hodivala, _Mughal Numismatic_', pp. 131-132; _EF (1634-36)_, pp. 68-69; _Ibid_ (1646-50); p.185; Tavernier, I, pp. 7-8, 20.

4. A.Hasan, '_Silver Currency Output of the Mughal Empire_', Pub. _ICSHR_, Vol.VI, No.I, (1969), pp. 85-116.

NUMBER OF MINTS

Not every mint coined issues in all the three metals. The following table gives the number of mints, in each reign, according to the metals in which coins were uttered. This is based on the detailed list of mints given in the Appendix - I.

REIGN	No.of mints coining gold silver and copper	No.of mint coing gold only.	No.of mint coining gold and silver.	No.of mints coining gold and copper.	No.of mints coining silver only	No.of mints coining silver and copper	No.of mints coining copper only	TOTAL
Akbar	13	4	3	1	14	15	35	85
Jahāngīr	6	2	7		11	3	3	32
Shāhjahān	10	1	12		13		5	41
Aurangzeb	19	1	25		35	4	3	87

OFFICIALS:

The dārogha was the superintendent of the mint.[1] He was appointed by a sanad bearing the seal of the dīwān-i ālā and at the recommendation of the dīwān-i sūba. He had a "conditional" mansab.[2] His duty was to supervise the working in the mint and for this reason he was required, "to be circumspect and intelligent ....(who) keeps every one to his work and shows zeal and integrity."[3] The opening and closing of the mint was at his pleasure,[4] and those wishing to get their bullion coined had to apply to him.[5]

Having examined, weighed or counted the bullion, old coins, silver or copper he issued receipt thereof to the 'customer's (mahājan, sarrāf, and other merchants), who had brought bullion or metal to be coined.[6] When the coined money was paid back, it was his duty to see that the mint charges (mahaūl-i dārul zarb), the rusūm-i ahlkārān (perquisites of

1. Akbarnāma, III, p.223. The English called him the 'mint-master', EF (1618-21), p.8.

2. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.183.

3. Āin, I, p.13.

4. EF (1618-21), p.8.

5. Ibid., (1661-64), p.22.

6. Kāghazāt-i-Mutafarriq, f. 67ab.

officials) and the *ujrat-i kārīgarān* (wages of workers) had been paid.[1] He had to see that the entries of daily income and expenditure in the mint had been entered into the registers (*siyāha*).[2] He along with the *mushrif* and the *tahvildār* used monthly to deposit in the state treasury the entire money collected at the mint on account of mint charges and from private profiteers.[3] Annually, he was to submit the income and expenditure registers to the *daftar dīwānī khālisa* for inspection.[4] It was also his duty to see that merchants who brought gold and silver did not sell it elsewhere and cause loss to the mint revenue. He used to take bonds from them that they would sell only at the mint.[5]

The *sarrāf* was to examine and count the coins when any payment was made or received at the mint.[6] A man who possessed special skill for determining the purity, weight and age of every coin was appointed to that office. The *Āīn*

---

1. *Kāghzāt-i mutafarriq*, f. 57ab.
2. *Ibid*.
3. *Ibid*.
4. *Ibid*: For the duties of *dārogha-i-dārulzarb*, see also *Hidāyatal Qawānin*, ff. 37ab, 38ab, 39a.
5. *Mirāt*, I, pp. 303, 340.
6. *Āīn*, I, pp. 13-14.

acknowledges that the success of the mint department depended on the experience of the sairafi (or sarrāf), as he "determines the degrees of purity' of the coin."[1] He was an employee of the mint and received a salary, and therefore is to be distinguished from the private bankers & money changers known as sarrāfa.[2] If there was any fault on his part, while dealing with the coins, he had to sustain the loss.[3]

The mu'aiyir (assayer) referred to in the Mirāt as an employee of the mint at Ahmadābād had identical duties i.e. assaying the purity of bullion, coins and other metals. He received Rs.4 per month.[4] Perhaps, he obtained additional income through perquisites.

The amīn assisted the dārogha[5] and had such duties as settling the differences between the dārogha and the workingmen and preventing the frequent quarrelling among the workers in the mint.[6] For his appointment he obtained a sanad from the dīwān-i ālá and conditional mansab with fixed salary.[7]

---

1. Āin, I, pp.13-14.
2. Ibid., p. 16.
3. EF (1634-36), p.169; Tavernier, I, p.25; J. Van Twist, p.37.
4. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.183.
5. Āin, I, p.15.
6. Ibid.
7. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.183.

The *mushrif*, appointed by a *sanad*,[1] acted in the capacity of an account keeper who recorded the daily expenses in the mint.[2] At Ahmadābād, his salary was Rs. 30 per month.[3]

The *tahwildār* kept the daily account of the profits and received the money collected on account of the mint charges.[4] He was also appointed by a *sanad* and had fixed salary.[5] At Ahmadābād, in addition to the *tahwildāri* of *dārulzarb*, he held the *tahwildāri* of *mahāl jauhari bāzār o manhāri*.[6]

The *Karora* as an employee of the mint is not mentioned in the *Āīn*. The *Mirāt* however, without mentioning his duties, refers to the *Karora* as an official attached to *mahāl dārulzarb* appointed by a *sanad* and having an 'unconditional' *mansab*.[7]

---

1. *Mirāt* (Suppl), P. 183.
2. *Āīn*, I, p.15. For the duties of *mushrif-i dārulzarb*, see also *Nigārnāma-i Munshi*, ff. 239b 240a.
3. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.183.
4. *Āīn*, I, p.16.
5. *Ibid*.. He held the rank of an *ahadi* under Akbar, *Āīn*, I, p. 3.
6. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.183.
7. *Ibid*.

The mahr-kun (engraver) under Akbar held the rank of a Yuzbashi i.e. the commander of one hundred. He engraved the dies of the coins on steel and other hard metals. The coins were stamped with these dies. The process followed was that first he made the dies by skilful cutting of the letters; and then the coins received from the zarrab were stamped. For two engravers working in the mint the monthly salary was 600 dāms.[1] The Mirāt makes no mention of the engraver.

The qānūngo is mentioned as one of the officials of the mint in the kāghzāt-i-mutafarriq.[2] But it does not describe his duties. The Āin and the Mirāt are also silent about him.

The wazn-kush (weighmen) weighed the bullion, the old coins brought to the mint and the new ones paid after having been minted.[3] For this work under Akbar, the commission he received was 1¼ dāms for every 100 Jalālī gold muhrs; 6 19/25 dāms for 1000 rupees and 11/25 dāms for 1000 copper dāms.[4] The Mirāt, on the other hand, mentions that at Ahmadābād he was a paid employee of the mint and received a fixed

1. Āin, I, pp. 17-18.

2. Kāghzāt-i-mutafarriq, f. 57ab.

3. Āin, I, p.16.

4. Ibid.

salary of Rs. 2 per month;[1] but perhaps the perquisites he received were in addition to his salary, which seems rather low.

The darbān (watchman) kept a watch on whatever was brought in or carried out and guarded the mint gate. At Ahmadābād, there were two watchmen; each was paid Rs.4 per month.[2]

These officials belonged to the regular staff appointed through sanad and drawing monthly salaries paid in cash or through x revenue assignments.

WORKERS:

Besides the regular staff there were a number of other workers employed at the mint.

The gudāzgar khām (melter of raw Ore) used to make small and large trenches in a tablet of clay and besmear them with grease. This done, he poured into them the melted gold and silver inorder to cast the above metals into ignots. In case of copper he did not use the grease but sprinkled the ashes which had almost the same effect. His fee was 2 3/5

---

1. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.183.
2. Ibid.

dams for gold, 5 dams and 13¼ jitals for silver and 4 dams and 21½ jitals for copper.[1]

The warraq kush (plate maker) made alloyed or impure gold into plates of six or seven mashas each in weight and of about six inches square. This done he carried them to the assay - master who having measured them put his stamp over them so that their order could not be altered and also to show that he had done his job. The plate maker received 42½ dams for each plate.[2]

The Gudazgar Pukhta (melter) melted refined plates of gold and cast them into ignots. His fee was 3 dams for every 100 gold muhrs.[3]

The zarrab (coiner), who received the gold, silver and copper ignots from the melter, used to cut the ignots into round pieces of the size of coined money. His fee for the above work was 21 dams and 1¼ jitals for 100 gold muhrs; Rs.53 dams, 8¾ jitals, for 1,000 Rs. , plus 28 dams if he cut the same weight of silver into quarter rupees; 20 dams for every 1000 copper dams; for the same weight of half and quarter

1. Ain, I, p.16.
2. Ibid.
3. Ain, I, p.17.

dāms, 25 *dāms*, and for half - quarter *dāms*, called *damris*, 69 *dāms*.[1]

The *sikkachī* was the helper of the engraver. He used to place the round metal pieces between two dies and struck with the hammer with such force that both the sides of the coin were stamped. His fee was charged in the following manner. For 100 gold *muhrs* he received 1 2/5 *dāms*; for 1,000 Rs. 5 *dāms*, 9½ *jitals*; for the weight of 1,000 rupees of small silver pieces, I *dām*, 3 *jitals* in addition; for 1,000 copper *dāms*, 3 *dāms*; for 2,000 half *dāms*, and 4,000 quarter *dāms*, 3 *dāms*, 18¾ *jitals*; and for 8,000 half quarter *dāms*, 10½ *dāms*. The *sikkachī* himself was a hammerer but if he required the help of an extra hammerer he had to pay to him one-sixth of his total earning of the day.[2]

The *sabbāk* (smelter) made the refined silver into round plates and received 54 *dāms* for every 1,000 rupees weight.[3]

The *qars-kob* had a double job to perform, first, he heated the refined silver; and then hammered it till it lost all smell of lead. His fee was 4½ *dāms* for 1,000 rupees.[4]

---

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Āīn*, I, p.18.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, p.19.

The *chāshnīgīr* examined the purity of refined gold or silver by putting it into fire. His commission for determining the purity of two *tolas* weight of gold was 1 2/5 *dāms* and for one *tola* weight of silver 3 *dāms*, 4½ *jitals*.[1]

The *nivāriya* collected the *khāk-i khālis* (pure ashes containing gold). He washed it and separated the gold fragments from it. But still a substance known as *kukrah* was left at the bottom of the pot. The *nivāriya* mixed it with quick silver at the rate of 6 *māshas* per *ser* and rubbed it so that the quicksilver from its predilective affinity drew the gold to itself. This done, the amalgamation was heated till the gold was separated from the quicksilver. For extracting the gold from two *sers* of *khāk-i khālis* he received 20 *dāms*, 2 *jitals*.[2]

PROFITEERS:

In addition to the mint officials and the workers mentioned above, there were a number of private persons who carried a very lucrative trade with the mint and out of whatever profit they received, they had to pay a fixed sum as "offering" to the government (*dīwān*).

---

1. *Ibid*.
2. *Āīn*, I, pp. 19,20.

The saudāgar (merchant) bought gold, silver and copper in the market and sold it to the mint to be coined.[1] Through this trade, he made a profit in the following manner. If gold was brought out of which 100 Lāl-i Jalāli muhrs were coined, then the profit of the merchant amounted to 12 Rs. 37d. 3½ jitals;[2] in case of silver, if 950 rupees were minted his profit was 3Rs. 21d. 10½ j. (or 4 Rs.20d. if the silver brought was lārī or shāhī);[3] and for 1044 dāms of copper he received 18d. 19½ j.[4] Out of the above profit, he had to pay to the government a monthly sum at the rate of 3 dāms for every 100 dāms net gain.[5]

The paniwār separated the silver from the copper and received for this work 1½ dāms for every tola of silver. Out of that income he paid 300 dāms monthly to the dīwān.[6]

The pāikār bought the salonī (dung ashes which contained fragments of gold) and kharal (ashes of the disc which contained silver pieces) from the shops of the goldsmiths in the city and carried it to the mint to be melted. Having

1. Ibid., p. 16.
2. Ibid., p. 32.
3. Ibid., pp. 32-33.
4. Ibid., p. 33.
5. Āīn, I, p.23.
6. Ibid., p.22.

washed and melted the ashes he made a great profit, out of which he paid to the government 17 _dāms_ for every maund of _salonī_ and 14 _dāms_ for every maund of _kharal_ on account of washing and melting fee.[1]

The _nichō ī wāla_ used to purchase the old coins in the market and brought them to the mint to be melted. From that business he apparently made considerable profits. For every 100 _tolas_ of silver thus collected and melted he had to pay 3½ rupees to the _dīwān_, and if he wished to coin the silver he had to pay the usual mint charges.[2]

The _khāk - shoy_ was the sweeper of the mint who carried the sweepings of the mint which contained fragments of gold and silver to his house to be washed. Thereby he gained a great profit, because it sometimes contained considerable quantity of gold and silver. He had to pay to the government 12½ rupees monthly.[3]

WORKING IN THE MINT:

Whenever the bullion, silver, old coins or copper was received at the mint to be coined the _dārogha_ along with

1. _Ibid._, pp. 22-23.
2. _Ibid._, p. 23.
3. _Āin_, I, p.23.

the amin, the mushrif, the tahwildar, the qanungo and the sarraf examined the quality and quantity of the metal and got it weighed.[1] A receipt, wherein was written the weight and the particulars of the metal, and in case of old coins their date and the mint of origin, used to be given to the owner.[2]

The bullion or silver, if it was unrefined, was handed over to the gudazgar kham (melter of raw ore) to be refined and cast into ingots.[3] This done, the ingots were handed over to the waraq kush (the platemaker) who made plates of six mashas each measuring six fingers length and breadth.[4] The plates then were taken to the gudazgar Pukhta who again melted them and cast them into ingots.[5] If the metal brought to the mint was proved to have been refined already, the above process was not necessarily followed and the bullion or silver, having been brought directly to the melter of refined metal, was cast into ingots.[6]

---

1. Kaghzat-i-Mutafarriq, f. 47ab.
2. Ibid.
3. Ain, I, p.16.
4. Ibid.
5. Ain, I, p.17.
6. Kaghzat-i-mutafarriq, f. 57b.

The ingots from the melter were carried to the *zarrāb* who cut them into round pieces of the size of coins.[1] Then the round pieces were taken to the *sikkachī* who placed them one by one between two dies and stamped them in the manner already described.[2] On the obverse side of the coin was stamped the name of the reigning emperor or the *kālima* or a couplet,[3] while on the reverse side the date and the name of the mint generally in honorific epithets.[4]

The method of refining gold and silver,[5] separating the silver from ashes,[6] the process of *kukrah*,[7] *burgāwatī*,[8] separating the silver from gold or silver from copper *etc.*[9] are best described in the *Āin* and the text has been very

---

1. *Āin*, I, p.17.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 18; see also *Kāghzāt-i-mutafarriq*, f.57b.

3. See the descriptive list of Mughal coins in Lucknow Museum by C.R.Singhal, *Catalogue of Mughal Coins*, pp. 11 - 139; also M.K. Hussain, *Catalogue of Coins of the Mughal Emperors*, pp. 1 - 137.

4. Hodivala, '*Historical Notes on the Honorific Epithets of Mughal Mint. Towns*', Pub. *JASB* (New series) Vol. XVII No.I, 1921, pp. 31 to 97.

5. *Āin*, I, pp. 16-17.

6. *Ibid.*, p. ~~22~~ 17.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

8. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

correctly rendered into English by H. Blochmann.[1]

The mint was housed in a walled enclosure where strict watch was kept at the gate, lest an unhappy incident might not occur. At Sūrat, the house, containing the mint, was next to the custom house.[2]

MINTING CAPACITY:

The records of the period tell us almost nothing about the regular capacity of a particular mint or mints for issuing specie in one or all the three metals. However, in the two dasteks belonging to Aurangzeb's reign and issued one to Shaikh Muhammad Fazil and the other to Mukhtār Khān, written in the name of the officials (āmla wa fa'ala) of the dārulzarb of the auspicious port of Sūrat, it was ordered that, if the merchants named brought gold and silver to the mint, the coins should be minted at the rate of 4000 a day.[3]

1. H. Blochmann Eng. tr. Āin, I, pp. 21, 23, 27, 24-25, 26 etc.

2. Fryer, I, p. 248.

3. The two dasteks known as Sūrat documents now in History Department, AMU 'Aligarh, one issued to Shaikh Muhd. Fazil, dates 21st Rabī I, 49th year of of Aurangzeb, and the other granted to Mukhtar Khān is dated 23rd Zilhijja 32nd year Ālamgir.
In one news report from Shāh-Jahānābad (Delhi), it was mentioned that 20,0000 tolas of gold and 20,00,000 tolas of silver was ordered to be given to the mutasaddi of the dārulzarb Shāhjahānābad to be coined into the ashrafi and rupees. But the waqai' does not mention the time fixed for delivery. See Akhbārāt, document No. 1970, dated 7th

Contd......

In a letter of English factors from Sūrat to the company, it is stated that if there happened to be no competitor the delivery could be 6,000 rupees a day.[1] Still in another despatch the same factors maintained, "we do not receive one day with another, since our silver was carryed in (mint), above 6,000 rupees. It was once brought to 9,000; but since the Dutch became competitors, they have 3,000 daily and our number is now discended to 5,000."[2] This shows that the regular capacity of the Sūrat mint was between 8,000 to 9,000 rupee coins per day. But still the doubt remains since the Factors fail to mention the position of other competitors than the Dutch. Subsequently, in the latter half of the century, the capacity of the Sūrat mint appears to have been increased to Rs. 30,000 a day.[3]

(Continued from the previous page)

Ramzan 26th year Ālamgīrī. In one English Factors letter from Sūrat to the Company, it is stated that 1700000 riāls were brought to the mint at the above city to be coined into rupee and the delivery was made in 33 days. But the letter in question does not mention the number of coins issued daily. See EF (1642-45), p.17.

1. Ibid., (1634-36), pp. 217-218.
2. Ibid., (1634-36), p.68.

3. 'The Sūrat Factory Outward Letter Book, Vol. II, 1663-71/72, p.187. Quoted by Irfan Habib in his, Potentialities of Capitalistic Development in the Economy of Mughal India', Pub. in 'Enquiry', New series, Vol. III, No.3 (Old series No.15) winter 1971, p. 45n-42.

MINT CHARGES:

The seigniorage and mint charges (mahsul-i darul-zarb) levied by the Mughals were not realized through mixing alloy in the coin but charged separately.[1] The Āin puts the mint charges as following : for 100 Lāl-i Jālali muhrs the charges were 6 muhrs, 12 Rs. and 3½ dāms; for rupee (silver) 5.2% and 5.3% (in case of silver called Lāri and Shāhi); for dāms (copper) 5.6% of the net amount coined.[2] The sources of the later period (17th C.) also show that the above rates by and large remained the same. Master writing in 1679 says that, 'the charges of the mint' amounted to about 6 per cent.'[3] Through a royal decree (A.D. 1628) Aurangzeb fixed the rate at 5% for Hindus and 2½ for Muslims.[4] The Hidāyat-al Qawānin, however, gives very low rates i.e. for Muslims 2½; in case of Hindus 2 1/6 if the customer was a recognised mahājan (mahājanān-i muqarrari) and 3% if a recognised sarrāf (sarrāf-i muqarrari).[5] In addition to the above seigniorage, out of

1. I.Habib, Currency System, p.3; Hodivala, Historical Studies, p.130.

2. Āin, I, p.32.

3. Master, II, p.304.

4. Mirāt, I, p.304.

5. Hidāyat-al Qawānin, f.38a. A payment of 67/100 per cent however, inaddition to the above mint charges, to be made to meet the minting costs, is prescribed by the Hidāyat-al Qawānin (Ibid.).

the total quantity of gold, silver or copper brought by an individual (either merchant or sarrāf) to be coined a certain amount was deducted on account of wages of mint workers and the cost of ingredients (comprising expenses on account of articles used in refining the metal such as dung, saloni, lead, quick silver, charcoal, water, etc.). The percentage of the above deduction varied in case of the three metals; in case of 100 muhrs coined, the deduction comprised 2 Rs. 18 d. 12½ j. working men's fee and 6 Rs. 8d. 8j. for ingredients (including 26d. 16¼ j. for dung; 4d. 20 j. for saloni; 1d. 10j for water; 11d. 5j for quick silver; 4 Rs. 4d. 6¼ for khāk-i khālis - charcoal and lead).[1]

In case of silver, if 950 Rs. were coined, the deduction on account of wages of the workmen was 2 Rs. 22d. 12j. (Viz. to the weighman 5d. 7¾ j; to the chāshnīgīr 3d. 4¼ j; to the melter 6d. 12½ j; to the zarrāb 2 Rs. 1d; to the sikkachī 6d. 12½ j and 10d. 15j on account of requisites (Viz. 10d. charcoal, and 16j. water).[2]

In case of copper, if 1,044 dāms were coined, 33d. 10j. and 15d. 8j. were to be deducted on account of workmen's fee and necessaries i.e. charcoal, water, clay, etc.[3] Thus along

1. Āin, I, p.32.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., I, p.33.

with the mint charges the wages of workers plus the deduction to meet the mint expenses had to be met by any one who brought the bullion to be minted. When any cash payment was made from the treasury, they charged 5% on gross and 5.3% on net to cover the mint charges.[1]

Notwithstanding the heavy mint charges one had to pay and the deduction on account of workmen's fee, according to the Āin, the profiteers never sustained loss in that business.[2] 950 Rs. bought 969 tolas 9 m. and 4s. of pure silver. Out of this 5t. and 4½s. was consumed while casting ingots. The remainder yeilded 1006 rupees and a surplus of silver worth 27½ dāms. Out of this again 2 Rs. 22d. 12j. was paid to the workers; 10d. 15j. spent on account of materials needed for melting; 50 Rs. 13d. minting charges paid to the government. The merchant thus received Rs.950 in exchange for the quantity of the silver he brought to the mint, and 3 Rs. 21d. and 10½ j. was his profit as noted earlier.

---

1. For the above deduction, see Selected Documents (Shāhjahān) pp. 26-27, 64, 70; Khulāsatus Siyāq, f. 84b; Zawābit-i Ālamgiri, f. 174a.

2. Āin, I, p.16.

The issuing of sikka was a part of a coronation ceremony for every new monarch;[1] and all the Mughal Emperors considered it a royal prerogative.[2] The mint, which none of their subjects could possess, therefore, was necessarily kept in khālisa.[3]

MAHĀL DĀRULZARB:

In big cities for the collection of mint dues, it constituted a separate mahāl in itself with fixed annual income and formed part of mahālāt-i sā'ir balda. At Ahmadābād, for example, it was a separate mahāl and its annual income was estimated at Rs. 154,362½.[4] The mint at Sūrat, however, was combined with the bāzār and the ghallamandī to make one mahāl, the annual jama' of which was Rs. 375,000.[5] From the the mints at Burhānpūr, Aurangābād and Cambay the income was Rs. 9026. 11 ans. 6 ps.,[6] Rs. 7131[7] and Rs. 7,000[8] respectively.

---

1. See Hodivala, Mughal Numismatic, pp. 330-332, who has discussed at length the importance attached to Khūtba and sikka at the coronation ceremony of new Emperor.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., Mir'āt (Suppl.) p.183.
4. Mir'āt (Suppl.) p.183. Dārulzarb grouped with mahālāt-i sā'ir at Sūrat, see Ms. Fraser 124, f.99a. For dārulzarb at Kābul, see Dastūr, B.M. Add. 6588, f. 23a.
5. Mir'āt (Suppl.), p. 223.
6. Dastūr, B.M. Add. 22831, f. 23a.
7. Khulāsat-ul Hind, pp. 127-128.
8. MS. Fraser 124, f. 94a.

Even at small towns like Junāgarh and Islāmnagar (both in Gujarat) the mints comprised separate mahāls. The annual income from the Junāgarh mint was Rs. 1250,[1] while from Islāmnagar it was Rs. 2500.[2]

From the English Factory records, however, we gather that twice the mint at Surat togehter with the custom house and the adjoining country was farmed out. In 1639, it was held by Masīhuzzamān;[3] but in 1641 he was ousted as a result of secret manoeuvering by Mu'izzul mulk (also known as Mīr Mūsa).[4] The latter made a bid for the farm at 7.2 million mahmūdīs (or 28,80,000 rupees) a year and took the farm of the custom house, the mint and the adjoining country.[5] But

---

1. Mirāt (Suppl.) pp.211-212. At the Junāgarh mint only mahmūdis were coined, Ibid.

2. Ibid., p.220. Islāmnagar mint also coined mahmūdīs - a silver coin 1 rupee = 2¼ mahmūdis. See also Mirāt, I, p.214.

3. EF (1637-41) Introduction, p.XVI. From 1629 to 1635 Mu'izzul mulk was the mutasaddī of Sūrat. In 1636 Masīh-uz-zāmān took the farm of the custom house, the mint and the adjoining country (around Sūrat) for 6.9 - million mahmūdis a year to be paid to the government. In 1639 he was ousted and the farming was granted to Mu'izzūlmulk who agreed to pay 7.2 million of mahmūdīs that is three lakhs mahmūdis more than his predecessor used to pay. Mu'izzulmulk held the farm up to 1642 when the farm was cancelled.

4. EF (1637-41), p.100.

5. Ibid, (1642-45), pp. 23-24.

when he failed to pay the full sum for which he had convenanted, his farm was cancelled, and the custom house and the mint, together with the country around Sūrat was again resumed to the _Khālisa_.[1]

Although Sūrat was held in _Jāgīr_ on several occasions yet, we do not know exactly whether the mint also formed a part of the assignment or was kept in the _Khālisa_.

ABUSES IN THE MINT:

The mint administration was accused of two things, _i.e._ dilatoriness[2] and undervaluing the bullion brought to be coined.[3] The first was caused by closing down the mint for an indefinite period and withholding the delivery. There are numerous complaints on record that whenever the mint official came to know of the arrival of a large quantity of imported silver, they shut up the mint under one pretext or the other and would not let the work start for days together.[4] Apparently this

---

1. _EF_ (1646-50), p. 24.
2. _Ibid_ (1630-33), p.103; Hamilton, p.336.
3. Hamilton, p.336.
4. Mentioning the closure of the mint at Ahmadābād for no other reason but their (mint officials) being informed of the arrival of huge quantity of silver, wrote the English Factors to the Company:"........When the mynt master or

Contd......

was done purposely to harass the merchants in order to extort illegal money.[1] The delay could also be caused if there were two or more than two competitors for getting their bullion coined at the mint.[2] Secondly, in view of the fact that the mint was a state institution, the officials became monopolists.[3] Knowing that those who wished to have the coined money of the country were in an urgent needs for cash to make their investments, tended to undervalue the bullion brought by such people to the mint so as to gain extra profits.[4] It was perhaps for the reasons noted above that people normally did not carry their bullion to the mint but rather sold to the sarrāf.[5]

(Continued from the previous page)

chief exchanger knoweth of much store, as that time of the year affordeth, both of our and the Mocha shipps, he will not suffer the mynt to goe, where by as nowe these five weekes it hath beene shutt up, and we compelled to leave a whole chest of ryalls and three ingotts unexchanged' See EF (1618-21), p.8.

1. Ibid., Master, II, p.81.
2. EF (1634-36), p.68.
3. Ibid.,(1618-21), p.8.
4. Ovington, p.78.
5. EF (1634-36), p.225. "Sending bullion to the local mints to be coined was not restored to "says Master "if it could be avoided, and practically only when a sufficient price for it could not be secured in the market when there was nothing for it but to have bullion coined, invariably a slow process lasting about a month, recourse was to have loans locally at an interest of 1¼ per cent per mensum or 15 per cent, per annum, which the company recovered by a rebate of 1 to 1¼ per cent on all money paid out, whether to third parties or their own servants and employees." Master I, p.137. In order to a avoid the troubles which

Contd.......

SARRĀF:

The highly metallic purity of the Mughal currency and the emphasise on weight and date necessitated the services of a class of *sarrāfs*[1] who possessed specialized skills for determining the alloy, weight and age of every coin.[2] Besides the *sarrāfs* employed by the mint department[3] and other merchants,[4] a number of them had their own private shops in cities

(Continued from the previous page)

the English Company faced in Bengāl for getting the currency of the country in exchange of imported silver, Master contracted with the sarraf Chitr Māll Shāh of Kāsimbazār to take yearly the whole lot of bullion brought by the Compnay, see *Ibid*, pp. 137-138. Whenever the silver was imported by the English samples were always first shown to the sarrafs in market" in hope of getting better terms from him." *EF (1646-50)*, p.331.

1. The *sarrāf* represented a mercantile caste which in our period had monopolized functions such as money lending, money changing and dealing in bullion, imported silver and old coins. They also issued hundīs and cashed them. At times they worked as bankers accepting deposits and advancing loans. They also insured the goods. In big cities the caste had its recognised head and all its members acted in concert. See *Mirāt*, I, pp.410-11; L.C. Jain, *Indigenous Banking*, p.28; J.Van Twist, p.73; Tavernier, I, p.28.

2. *Āin*, I, p.16.

3. See the earlier section mint 'officials', pp. 215-16.

4. Big merchants and the European Companies employed their own *sarrāfs*. For the *sarrāf* employed by the English, see *EF (1618-21)*, p.133; *Ibid.*, (1651-54) pp. 42, 106-7, 142; Master, I, pp. 144, 394.

and towns. If Tavernier is to be believed, "a village must be very small if it has not a money - changer, whom they call *shroff*."[1]

A number of functions of the *sarrāf* are mentioned by the contemporaries. Primarily, he was the assayer of coins. Whenever any payment was made or received, the services of a *sarrāf* were indispensable.[2] Because of his skill for testing the purity of the metal, he could at the very sight detect the alloy.[3] For this service, his commission was 1/30 to 1/16 per cent of the coins checked by him.[4]

The *sarrāf* having obtained the newly coined money from the mint introduced it into circulation. He bought the bullion and old coins in the market and carried them to the mint for minting. Although the mint was open to every body; nevertheless, in practice it was largely monopolised by the *sarrāfs*.[5] The *English Factors* at Sūrat (1636) wrote to the

---

1. Tavernier, I, p.28.

2. J. Van Twist, p.73.

3. *Ibid*.

4. Elkington's notes, *Supplementary Calendar*, p.46; Tavernier, I, p.25.

5. *EF (1634-36)* p.68; *Ibid* (1642-50), p.209; *Ibid*., (1646-50), pp. 6, 83, 186, 187, 243, 248; *Ibid* (1651-54) p.37; *Ibid* (1655-60), p.244; Master, II, 303-4; J. Van Twist, pp. 72-73.

Company : "Concerning the coyneing of your gold and silver into the species of this country (it) free for us, though not safe. We should have to do with such dangerous people in the mint that we dare not adventure; nor will the most cunning merchants of these posts on any occasion, but sell all to the Sharoffes, to whom it is most proper and are in that particular content with very small profit."[1] Another reason why the people preferred to sell their bullion to the sarrāf was the delays met with in the mint.

The sarrāf who had a ready-made stock of fresh coins could afford to wait while supplying the immediate needs of his clients from his own stock of coins.

From the correspondence of the European factors (particularly the English), one can very well see that the prices in the bullion market, with special reference to the imported silver, were controlled by the sarrāf. Whenever the sarrāfs came to know that large quantity of silver was to be landed, they pulled down the market prices and forced the English to agree to their prices. The Factors, pressed as they were for the money, had no choice, but to accept the prices offered to them.[2] In one case (in 1648), even the

---

1. EF (1634-36), p.226.

2. EF (1665-67), p.265; Ibid, (1646-50) p.187; Ibid., pp. 83-84; J.Van Twist, p.73.

mutasaddī of Surat, and the dārogha of the mint joined hands with the sarrāfs to force the English to sell the silver ingots at 69¾ pice per tola, the prices offered by the sarrāfs, whereas in the previous year (1647) the prices had been 71 pice per tola. "Complaint was therefore made to the governor (mutasaddī), but no redress has been obtained, nor may any bee expected from a villaine who hath wholly ruined the trade of this place by oppressing and robbing men of all qualities, especially merchants, either directly by seizing upon their goods or indirectly by sharing in the profit of whatever bought or sold......." The Factors go on to say that, "the governor not only connyves at the sharroffs but support them."[1]

In another case, the English (in 1617) suffered a loss of 15% while they exchanged the Spanish silver with Indian currency. Writing from Agra, the English Factors reported to the Company that, "this cometh to pass by the villainy of the money - changers here, that are called in the Indian tongue sharafs men that are permitted by the king both to raise and abase the value of money according to their own pleasures, where by it cometh to pass that your dollars yield you less here than in any other Mohemetan country, either Turkie, Persia or Barburie. No remedy for this can I advice, where by the convetousness of then griping rascals may be restrained, but

---

1. EF (1646-50), p.187.

this that you would write to my lord ambassador to solicit the king to give us leave to put our money into the mint for the converting of it into rupees of the country, paying ordinary fees to the mint for the stamping of the same."[1]

It thus appears that the *sarrāf* had practical sanction of the government to monopolize the purchase of the bullion, silver and old coins in the market and the supply thereof to the mint.[2]

Incidentally, it may be noted here that in 1665-6 when the great scarcity of copper drove the *dām* out of circulation in Gujarāt, the *sarrāfs* of Ahmadābād started issuing their own *dāms* of iron pices and they sold them at high prices. This continued for long and ended only when the government came out with its own copper *dāms* of lesser weight.[3]

---

1. *Letters Received*, VI, p.193.
2. *EF (1646-50)*, p.187; *Ibid*, p.329; *Ibid* (1661-64), p.22; *Letters Received*, VI, p.193.
3. *Mirāt*, I, p.266.

CHAPTER VIII

PORT ADMINISTRATION

Besides the land revenue, which formed the bulk of income to the Imperial treasury, the next major source was custom duty, levied on merchandise, imported or exported by sea, and collected at the ports.[1] With the conquest of Gujarāt, Bengāl and Orissa, a number of ports lying in those provinces came into the possession of the Mughals. Naturally this necessitated the establishment of administrative institutions at ports.

The administration of a port differed from the administration of an ordinary town in two respects : firstly, the port was placed under an official called mutasaddī who was otherwise normally a petty official in town revenue department, but in port administration he had very wide powers. Secondly, the port contained two distinct mahāls, which did

---

1. According to the Mirāt-i Sikandarī, the sultān Sikandar bin Bahlol, the ruler of Gujarāt often used to say that, "the Pādshāhī of Delhi depends on wheat and barley where as the pādshāhī of Gujarāt on diamonds and pearls. The reason is, that, the Pādshāh of Gujarāt had 84 ports." (p.247). Really the income from the ports was very large. An idea of the annual income from the ports may be estimated from the table below:

Custom house (farza)	Year	Annual income in Rs.	Sources
Sūrat	1696-97	11,70,000	MS.Fraser 124, f.101b.
Cambay		23,000	Ibid., f.94a.
Gogha		40,000	Ibid.
Broach	1714	45,470	Ibid., f.101b.
	1715	44,406	Ibid.
	1716	30,323	Ibid.
Huglī	1683	75,000	The Diary of William Hedge, I, p.61.

not exist in other towns, namely, *mahāl farza* and *mahāl jahāzāt*. The former was concerned with sea-borne trade, checking goods, searching passengers and collecting customs, while the latter included the charges of supervision of harbour, anchorage of ships, collection of anchorage fee, *etc.* In other respects there was little difference. For example, the port towns too had similar officials, such as *qil'adārs*, *qāzīs*, *Kotwāls*, *muhtasibs*, *waqā'inavīs*, *thānadārs*, *etc.*, to look after the general administration both in side the town and around it. It also contained same fiscal divisions, as in other towns mentioned elsewhere, for the collection of city or market dues (*sāir jihāt*) and identical officials to man them.

Barring the port of Sūrat and other ports of Gujarāt, our information is meagre, for the sources do not provide a consistent picture, with regard to the affairs at the other ports. And hence what will be mentioned hereafter, is mainly based on the evidence for the province of Gujarāt and its ports. However, from such fragmentary information as is available for other ports, it appears that most ports were similarly governed; and the structure of administration which the Mughals established at Sūrat may be taken applicable to other ports in the provinces of Thatta, Bengāl, Orissa and the Coromandel Coast.

PORT, AN INDEPENDENT UNIT:

For administrative convenience, the bigger ports were constituted into separate units, forming a subdivision of the _sūba_ but practically independent of its authority. The smaller ones either made into a dependency of the larger port, or were grouped together to make one unit. The port of Sūrat which was a _sarkār_ and comprised 31 _mahāls_ including the _bandar_ and surrounding territories was separately placed under the _mutasaddi_.[1] In case of smaller ports, such as Broach, also a _sarkār_ headquarters, the _pargana hawīlī_ and _bandar_ constituted two _mahāls_ of which the former belonged to the _faujdārī_ of the above _sarkār_ while the latter was made a dependency of Sūrat and placed under the _mutasaddi_ of that port.[2]

Similarly, the port of Cambay which previously together with the ports of Gogha and Gandhār was held by the _mutasaddi_ of Sūrat was later on made a separate unit.[3] The _pargana_ Chaurāsī, which comprised three _mahāls_ _i.e._ Chaurāsī

---

1. _Mirāt_ (Suppl.), p.222.

2. _Ibid._, p. 205.

3. Several times the administration of ports Sūrat and Cambay was combined and then separated. For references See Purchas, III, p.2. Muqarrab Khān held both Sūrat and Cambay. On the separation of Cambay from Sūrat see _Mirāt_, I, p.204; on their being united again see _Ibid._, p.223; _EF (1646-50)_, p.196. For reseparation, _Mirāt_, I, p.234.

proper, Gogha and Cambay, itself belonged to the *sarkār* of Aḥmadābād. But the ports of Gogha and Cambay, together with Gandhār - a minor port, were separately placed under the same *mutasaddī* who often was also the *faujdār*, *thānadār*, *bandardār* and the *dārogha* of mint at Cambay.[1]

THE MUTASADDĪ:

The chief administrator of the port was the *mutasaddī*.[2] Literally the designation meant merely a clerk.[3] But the *mutasaddīs* appointed to administer the ports such as Sūrat, Cambay and Huglī, particularly in case of the former port, were reckoned among the high officials of the empire.[4] Over the fiscal administration of the port town he had complete control. While with regard to general administration his powers were of a supervisory nature. His functions included custom collection, *mahāl farza o khushkī*, harbour, anchorage, markets, mint and

---

1. *Mirāt*, (Suppl.), pp. 193-194.

2. For the jurisdiction of the mutasaddī see *Mirāt* (Suppl.), pp. 183, 184, 223; *Letters Received*, II, pp. 157-158; Ibid., III, p.271; Hawkins, *Early Travels*, pp. 63, 71; *Futūhāt-i-Ālamgīrī*, f.139a; Thomas Best, p.20; *Mirāt*, I, p.353; *Ibid* (Suppl.) pp. 180-181.
3. See Steingass, p.1160.

4. See Appendixed list of Sūrat mutaṣaddīs. Some of them were high nobles and were esteemed both in their private lives and as officials. Commenting on the appointment of Muṣṭafā Khān as mutaṣaddī of Sūrat (1660-63) the English Factors wrote from the above port, ".....And be pleased to know hee is a nobleman of greatest quality of any that ever was Governor of Surratt, and maintains his post accordingly. Hee had at court the pay of 2000 horses (which is the manner of their taking degree and place and bespeakes their honour". (*EF (1661-64)*, p.103).

finally the responsibility to defend the port both from land and sea.

He was directly appointed from the Imperial court through a sanad of dīwān-i ālá.[1] Anybody could be appointed to the above office. However, as far as possible, in the appointment of the mutasaddī, besides other things, it was desired that the man due to be appointed should have perfect knowledge of judging the qualities of horses and jewels.[2] His mansab varied in accordance with the personal and official status of the person appointed.[3] He held the office at the pleasure of the Emperor. He could be dismissed or transferred, mansab reduced or post down-graded at the complaint of merchants of the port against misuse of authority, covetousness and tyranny,[4] and finally his failure to discharge duties properly.[5]

---

1. Mirāt (Suppl.), pp.194,222. According to MS. Fraser 124, during the reign of Bahādur Shāh the nāzim-i Sūba,Ahmadābād, was empowered to appoint mutasaddī, f.79a.

2. It was not necessary that an officer of regular services alone could be appointed mutasaddī. For example, one 'Alī Akbar, who was a merchant from Isfahān, and who came to Hindūstān, stayed at Cambay and conducted his business from there, was appointed mutasaddī both of Sūrat and Cambay. The plea taken in his appointment was that he was a merchant and had good knowledge of judging horses and jewels. It was thought that if such a man was appointed to the above office he could administer the port in an efficient manner. See Pādshāhnāma, II,607; Mirāt, I, p.222.

3. For the mansab of some of the mutasaddīs at Sūrat see Appendix II.

4. There are large number of cases when mutasaddīs were removed at the general complaint [redacted] either by merchants or

Contd......

He was paid [redacted] either in cash or through assignment.[1]"

None of the ships could enter or leave the harbour, load or unload cargo unless he issued a permit.[2] Nor could the goods imported by sea be carried into the country unless the king's seal was affixed on it, and it was declared checked and custom paid in the custom house.[3] Those (foreigners) who wished to land and carry on their trade had to approach him for permission.[4] The supervision of the custom house such as

---

(Continued from the previous page)

residents of the port. For the dismissal of Ghiyāsuddīn Khān at the complaint of merchants headed by Mirzā Muazzam a rich merchant of Sūrat, EF (New Series) Vol.I, pp.283-284. Masīh-uzzāman was transferred for no other cause but because he got imprisoned Vīrjī Vohra, the merchant prince of Sūrat, Ibid (1637-41) Intro. p.XVI. Mirzā Amīn was replaced because the English complained against him, Ibid.,(1646-50) p.62. Itimād Khān, the mutasaddī of Cambay was dismissed, his personal mansab reduced and post down-graded because he embezzled Rs.1345/- from the revenue of Gogha port, Mirāt I, p.382. For similar other cases see Appendix, op.cit.

5. In 1656 when it was felt that Hāfiz M. Nāsir had failed to perform his duties properly as mutasaddī both of Sūrat and Cambay, he was recalled. Cambay was separated from Sūrat and put in charge of 'Abdul Latīf, younger brother of Mīr Mūsa and Muhammad Amīn was appointed to govern Sūrat, see Mirāt, I, p.234.

1. Hāfiz Muhammad Nāsir as mutasaddī used to receive annually cash salary amounting to Rs.80,000, Mirāt, I, p.229. In MS. Fraser 124, the salary of the mutasaddī at Sūrat in 1726 is stated to be Rs.15000 a month. Out of which Rs.13000 was his pay and Rs.2800 he received for patrolling the sea. See MS. Fraser 124, f.101a. Hakīm Masīhuzzamān on being appointed to port Sūrat was assigned a jāgīr worth 5 Lākhs of mahmudis. See EF (1634-36), Intro., p.XV.

2. Letter's Received, II, p.258; Ibid., III, pp.270-271; Thomas Best, p.20; Letters Received, VI, pp.78-81; EF (1630-33), Intro. pp. XXV, 157.
3. Thevenot, p.38; Fryer, I, p.247; Letters Received, VI, pp. 78-81; Pieter Van Den Broeke, p.210; EF (1661-64), p.15.
4. Hawkins, Early Travels, p.71.

cheking the goods and persons and the collection of custom was a part of his main duty.[1] But this he usually left to his *nāibs* (*Shāhbandar* or customer).[2] It was his responsibility to see that whatever was imported or exported did not evade the custom.[3] The goods received for export from the country was checked at *mahāl-i khushkī* and those imported at *mahāl farza*. Both the check posts' were under his immediate supervision.[4]

On the fiscal side, as the *Mirāt* says, "the *dīwānī* of *sarkār* Sūrat was sometimes held by the *mutasaddī* and sometimes combined with the *dīwānī* of the *sūba* (Ahmadābād)."[5] He thus had also authority over the market administration, mint and the collection of land revenue from the

---

1. Tavernier, I, p.11; *Letters Received*, IV, p.78; Thevenot, p.163.

2. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), pp. 194, 222.

3. *Letters Received*, IV, p.78.

4. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), pp. 194; *Futūhāt-i 'Ālamgīrī*, f.139a. According to the MS. Fraser 124, in the year 1723 it was however reported that Ahmad Chalpī 'Abdul Rahīm, Lal Mani mahājan and other people of port Sūrat petitioned to Nawāb Momat Khān, sūbahdār of Gujarat, that there should be two mutasaddis i.e. one for khushkī mandī and the other for farza. Their request was granted. See MS. Fraser 124, f. 263a.

5. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), p.222.

Parganas attached to the above sarkār.[1] Nothing could be sold and purchased in the markets of the port town over and above him.[2] Several times following a quarrel with the English, the mutasaddi at Sūrat forbade everybody in the market to sell anything to them.[3] On the arrival of a commodity in the market, he used to have the right of first purchase.[4] He also insisted that none compete with him in selling any commodity.[5] In the capacity of the dīwān-i sūba

1. Mirāt, I, p.234.

2. EF (1618-20), pp. 121,151.

3. Letter's Received, IV, pp. 78,81,83,85.

4. Mirāt, I, pp. 260-262; Master, II, p.80, 'Criticizing the purchasing monopoly', established by the mutasaddi at the market of Cambay port, which put the entire bāzār transaction into disorder, the English Factors from the above port reported to the Company (1622). "The governor's buying of goods, which course he still continewe-th and hath seven dayes past hath putt another project. one footte for his gaine, which is extorting from the brokers of this town one of their twoe in the hundred brocheridge for whatt goods (bought) by them; to which end hath commanded to all brokers to give a dayly accompt of whatt they buye and to all the merchaints for they a lycke accomptt of whatt they sell and that none may be sould but in the bāzār; which in-accostomed extorsion doth cause the merchantts ever since nott to sell and the brokers refuse to buy ...... And by reason of course to the poore weavers cannot worke, beinge they cannott vend what they make..... the Governor, instead of justice which hee should give, unjustly whiptt and inprysoned some and the rest runne awaye, with which divers merchantts and brokers are lickewise fled; for (see) ever since the towne hath bine in an uprower and hendreth us from our proceedings" See EF (1622-23), p.169)

5. EF (1622-23), pp. 169,173.

which many a mutasaddis of Sūrat held, he recommended the appointment of administrators and tax collectors of markets.[1] Similarly, he exercised considerable control over the working of the mint.[2] According to the Mirāt, the mutasaddi of Cambay was also quite often the dārogha of the mint.[3] In view of the abuses in the mint, even when he himself did not hold the dāroghāi, it was he to whom merchants complained.[4] On the other hand, it was his duty to see that the bullion imported was carried direct from the customhouse to the mint. For this, he could forbid the sarrāfs throughout the city from purchasing bullion brought by the Europeans.[5] There are reports that following a quarrel with merchants and in order to extort bribes from them, often the mint at Sūrat was closed for a number of days, at the instance of the mutasaddi.[6]

---

1. Mirāt (Suppl.), pp. 180-181.

2. Twice the mint at Sūrat was held under farming by the mutasaddi. For reference see chapter on 'mint'. In 1684 Kārtalab Khān, the mutasaddi was asked to send 100 zarrābs from the Sūrat mint to the court to work for the Emperor. See Akhbārāt, document No.2361, dated 24th Shabān, 27th year of Aurangzeb.

3. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.193.

4. EF (1646-50), p.187.

5. For reference see the sources cited for sarrāf, pp.215 n 5, 277 n.2.

6. EF (1661-64), p.22.

According to the *Mirāt*, the *mutasaddi* at Sūrat and Cambay, besides the above office, also held the office of the *faujdār* and *thānādār* around the above ports.[1] For the defence of the port and town, he maintained strong military contingents,[2] strengthened fortifications[3] and sometimes went out to defend the other ports lying within his jurisdiction.[4] He patrolled the coastal areas and kept a vigilant watch over the sea upto two leagues beyond the harbour, which lay within his authority.[5]

Although town officials such as *Kotwāl*, *qāzī*, *muhtasib* and *naqāi* were not directly under his authority they, however, had to obey him. On several occasions, the *Kotwāl* of Sūrat at the instance of the *mutasaddi* had to arrest or put under house confinement the merchants who dared defy his orders.[6]

---

1. For *mutasaddigari* and faujdārī of Sūrat both held by one man. See *Mirāt*, I, pp.229, 234, 312. For Cambay, *Ibid.* (Suppl.), p.193.
2. *Mirāt*, I, p.361; *Ibid.*, (Suppl.), p.222.
3. After Shivājis invasion of Sūrat (1664), Ināyat Khān, the mutasaddī built a fort there and equipped the port with other fortifications. At the time of Marātha invasion, it was felt that the invader was able to cause 'much ruin and a great loss to the merchants and residents of the above city', because the port that time had no proper fortifications. See, *Mirāt*, I, pp. 256-257.
4. *Letters Received*, I, p.150; Ibid., II, p.261; Hawkins, *Early Travels*, p.71.
5. *EF (1678-89)*, p.343.
6. Following a quarrel with the English over certain guns purchased by the mutasaddi, the former were put to house arrest for 15 days by the orders of the latter, *EF (1661-64)* pp. 13-14; *Ibid.*, (New Series) Vol.II, p.312.

He could ask the Kotwāl to shut the city gates so that none could go out the city.[1] With the help of the Kotwāl, weavers and labourers were made to work for him.[2] In one robbery case, the qāzī sided with the mutasaddī.[3] He was usually afraid of the waqāi', for, the latter could report to the headquarters. But the waqāi' himself, before submitting his despatch, showed it to the mutasaddī.[4] Normally, the mutasaddī used to consult the above officials on all important matters relating to port administration.[5]

On behalf of the government, he appeased as chief customer in mandi or bāzār and made purchases of horses,

---

1. By the orders of the Sūrat governor all the Europeans were confined within the city wall for, it was reported that certain hat'smen had taken the ship of 'Abdul Ghaffūr (1691), Ovington, p.239.

2. At Combay weavers were prohibited by the mutasaddī neither to work for English nor to sell to them any cloth EF (1622-23), p.169. At Baroch also weavers were forbidden to sell none of the baftas to anybody untill the mutasaddis demand was fulfilled, EF (1661-64), pp. 19-20.

3. Ibid (1618-21), p.81.

4. Ibid, New Series, (1678-84) p.310. In one instance Kārtalab Khān, the mutasaddī of Sūrat, had to bribe the courier, for, the former feared lest the latter might report to the Emperor correctly. Mirāt, I, p.312.

5. When any matter of consequence is brought, says Ovington, before (the governor), he seldom determines, it without the consultation and concurrence of other officers of the city, the cogy, the vacanavish, and cotoual." Ovington, pp. 136-137.

corn, arms and rarities for the Emperor.[1] He used to keep government treasury.[2] He acted as chief negotiator on behalf of the government with regard to the entire foreign trade[3] by sea, and supervised the annual presents and pilgrim trips to Arabia.[4] The cartmen and porters could not be engaged for transport if he chose to differ.[5] Following a quarrel with the foreign merchants, he could force the dallāl and labourers not to work for them.[6]

---

1. Annually large number of horses for the royal stable were purchased by the mutasaddī at Sūrat. See Akhbārāt, document No.2533, dated 19th Safar, 28th regnal year of Aurangzeb; Pādshāhnāma, II, p.607; Mirāt, I, p.282. For the purchase of grain for Imperial requirements, see Akhbārāt, document No.1801, dated 22 Jumāda I, 25th year of Aurangzeb, 3 lākhs maund of corn was purchased in the above year; Ibid., document No.2079, dated 25 Zilqada, 26th year Aurangzeb, for 2 lākhs ~~xx~~ maund of corn procurred by the mutasaddī. In the year 1684-85 about 2700 guns were purchased at Sūrat for royal use. See Ibid., document 2676, dated 26th Rabī II, 28th year 'Ālamgīrī; see also Ibid., document No.2585, dated 25th Rabī I, 28th year of Aurangzeb for cannons. For rarities see Letters Received, II, p.179.
2. See Mirāt, I, pp. 285-230.
3. Commenting over the authority of Muqarrab Khān as mutasaddī, the English Factors from Sūrat wrote, "As for Mocrab Chan, all business concerning us and our trade is referred unto him, and as he adviseth so things here will pass, and what he granteth there will be confirmed here. Therefore all good means must be used to give him content and to frustrate his expectation of dealing for your goods." Letters Received, II, pp.157-158.
4. Mirāt, (Suppl.), p.223; when (in 1693-94) Gang-i Sawāī, ~~which~~ which used to sail to Arabia, was captured by the English, the mutasaddī of Sūrat, I'timād Khān, was asked to look into the matter and to make preparations for retaliation, see Khāfī Khān, II, pp.421-422.
5. EF (1655-60), p.315.
6. Ibid., (1622-23), p.169.

It was he through whom the government mercantile policy was executed. All important announcements and decisions were made public through sounding drums and by putting posters at walls.[1] He helped to fix the market rates by settling the values of goods in the customhouse. A newly appointed mutasaddī was advised to practise politeness and hospitable attitude towards the foreigners, so that, they might not leave the port and lead to the loss of revenue.[2] If the strangers disturbed the normal course and created troubles at sea he was to retaliate on land.[3] Thus with regard to port administration his authority was wide enough. We do not know much about the mutasaddīs of other ports, but we are sure of those appointed to administer the port of Sūrat. The scope of their authority would appear to be still wider if it is taken into account that most of them, as shown in the list given in Appendix, in addition to the port of Sūrat, also held control of the ports of Cambay, Broach, Gandhār and Gogha at a time.[4] Still surprising was the

1. For the announcement of important decisions, news and declarations posters used to be set up at the doors of the customhouse and at other public places. See EF (1655-60) p.209; Ibid.(1661-64) p.209. For announcement through beating drums see, William Hedge, I, p.38.

2. Mirāt, I, p.353.

3. For retaliation at land see Khāfī Khān, op.cit.

4. See appendix No.II, A number of mutasaddīs held the ports of Sūrat, Cambay, Broach, Gandhār and Gogha. Even in case of Huglī and Kāshmbāzār there was one mutasaddī (chief customer) see Willaim Hedge, I, p.52.

fact that they had their sons and relatives to work as customers at the above ports.[1] No doubt this was aimed at to fulfill the covetuous designs to whatever extent they could. For if the son as customer sought to misuse authority for extorting bribes, inflated the rates of custom or restored to other means of tyranny, the father as mutasaddī could undo them.[2] This was, however, possible when the port was held in farm.

Thus, the office of the mutasaddī was a great source of authority, which could be easily misused, and income illegally charged. It enabled ample opportunities for private trade. Perhaps the lust for power and greed for money had led a number of officials and non-officials to aspire for the above office. At least in one case, the mutasaddī even went to the extent to bribe the imperial headquarters and high officials once to get his term extended and then for seeking reappointment. On both

---

1. When Mustafá Khān was mutasaddī of Sūrat (1660-63) he had his son to act as customer at the customhouse of the above port. See EF (1661-64) pp. 203-204; Ināyat Khān, who succeeded Mustafá Khān, on assuming charge dismissed the entire old staff of the customhouse. He appointed his elder son customer and filled the other offices by his own men. See Ibid., pp. 203, 204, 205. In both the above instances the sons misused authority and practised a number of abuses beyond limits which ultimately led to the dismissal of their respective fathers from the post of mutasaddīs. See Ibid.

2. Commenting on the misuse of authority being practised by the son of Ināyat Khān, the mutasaddī, the Dutch chief at Sūrat wrote in a letter dated 20th Sept., 1663, "The merchants have suffered many affronts from the new governor's son, who had been made head of the custom house and arrogated to himself so much authority that one would thought he was in his father place .... complaints were made to the governor who promised better treatment." (See EF (1661-64), p. 206).

occasions the bribe had the desired effect.[1] The presents in the form of rarities, horses and jewels sent by the mutasaddis became a normal practice obviously to gain favour of the Emperor and of those close to him.[2]

MUTASADDĪ AND THE SŪBAHDĀR:

The direct appointment of the mutasaddī from the imperial headquarters implied that in theory he was desired to remain independent of the sūbahdār. However, the sūbahdār enjoyed certain powers over him. For example, in one instance (1672) the merchants of Sūrat headed by Mirzā Muāzzam took their petition to the sūbahdār, Muhammad Amīn Khān, complaining against the oppression caused by the mutasaddī, Ghiyāsuddīn Khān who was subsequently removed from office.[3] In another instance following the reports of maladministration and negligence on the part of mutasaddī of the same port, and of increasing European attacks on merchant ships of Sūrat bound

1. By bribe Mīr Mūsa succeeded twice : once he got his term extended, EF (1630-33), p.193; and second time he was reappointed, Ibid, (1637-41), pp. XVI, p.281.

2. For Peshkash see Mirāt, I, pp. 208,215,218,222,230; Akhbārāt dated 9th Ramzan, 44th year of Aurangzeb.

3. EF (New Series), I, pp. 283-284.

for Arabia Prince Muḥammad A'ẓam, the governor of Aḥmadābād (1701-1705) was required to look into the matter and after consultation with the merchant and others at the above port, to report the real cause and to make proper arrangements. The plea taken in the above case was that since the port of Surat was included in the _ṣūba_ of Aḥmadābād, it was requisite that the _ṣūbahdār_ should look into the affairs of that port.[1]

In another case still, the _mutasaddī_ was warned by Shā'ista Khān, the governor of Aḥmadābād, for unnecessarily detaining Tavernier at Sūrat to the effect, "either to allow him (Tavernier) to depart, or otherwise he would have to resign."[2]

MUTASADDĪ AND QILA'DĀR:

The sources do not clearly specify whether the _mutasaddī_ was superior in authority or the _qila'dār_. At Sūrat both are referred to as governors _i.e._ one who governed the city and received customs on behalf of the government, and the other who commanded the castle.[3] They were independent of each other.[4] However, it appears that the powers of the _mutasaddī_ were more

---

1. _Mir'āt_, I, p. 353.
2. Tavernier, I, p.409.
3. Thevenot, p.27; Tavernier, I,p.6; Ovington, p.136; _EF(1622-23)_, p. XXVIII.
4. Thevenot, op.cit.; Fryer, I, pp. 248-49.

wider than the *qilādār*. For the former had to his charge the administration of the entire city and the port while the latter's authority was confined to the four walls of the fort.[1]

THE SHĀHBANDAR:

The official whose main concern was the collection of customs at the port was *shāhbandar*.[2] He acted as deputy (*nāib*) of the *mutasaddi*.[3] He was the chief of the customhouse.[4] In the absence of the *mutasaddī* he had complete control over all matters relating to customs. The Europeans variously called him *dārogha* (of the custom house), *shāhbandar*, or customer.[5]

In view of the many duties and responsibilities assigned to him, the *mutasaddī* was not always present at the customhouse where the work actually was done and routine management looked

---

1. Ovington, op.cit.; Fryer, op.cit.

2. *Bahār-i-Ajam*, II, p.152.

3. *Mirāt* (Suppl.), pp.194, 222; Hawkins, *Early Travels*, pp. 71-72; *Letters Received*, I, p.150; *Ibid.*, II, pp. 261,298; *EF (1630-33)*, pp. 99; Ibid. (1655-60), p.316; The Diary of William Hedge, I, p.62; Nicholas Dawnton, p.80.

4. *Ibid.*, See also Moreland, *The Shāhbandar in the Eastern Seas*, Pub. JRAS, Oct. 1920,pp.517-533. According to him, "in the Indian area Shāhbandar means a consul or a harbour-master or a man occupying some intermediate position." (Ibid.,p.533).

5. See Pieter Van Den Broeke, p.215; Fryer, I,pp. 247-248; Hawkins, *Early Travels*, p.72; Thevenot, p.38. *Letters Received*, II, p.261; Ibid., p.270; *EF (1618-21)*, p.151; Ibid., 1624-29), p.28; Ibid.(1655-60), p.316.

after by the Shāhbandar.[1] He checked the goods and searched the person of passengers, estimated the value of the goods at market rate and collected the custom. The goods already checked were released after having been stamped with the King's seal.[2] The daily account of the customhouse, wherein was written the particulars of goods, passengers, income and expenditure, was prepared under his supervision and submitted to the mutasaddi.[3] He, however, had delegated powers and could not act at his own. For example, he could not permit any foreign ship to enter the harbour, to load and unload cargo or any stranger to land and open business, unless required to do so by the mutasaddi.[4] Furthermore, if the port was held under farm, the Customer was merely the agent of the farmer.[5] However, there are reports

---

1. As far as the references in the sources go, the mutasaddi was not always present at a port if he had more than one ports to his charge. For example, the mutasaddi of Sūrat in addition to the above port also held the ports of Cambay, Broach, Gandhār and Gogha and therefore sometimes he remained at Sūrat, sometimes at Cambay and, other ports and in his absence his work was done by his naib. The former, however, whenever went out, used to leave detailed instructions to the latter to carry on the work. Thus in the accoun of the Europeans the customer figured very commonly perhaps more than the mutasaddi.

2. For strict checking, searching and custom collecting by the customhouse officials headed by the customer, See Tavernier, I,p.11; Letters Received, IV,p.78; Thevenot,p.163; EF (1618-21),pp.187,188; Ibid,(1622-23), p.307.

3. Ibid. (1630-33), p.116.

4. Hawkins, Early Travels, p.71; Letters Received,II,p.258. For the incapability of the customer at Cambay who was deputy to the mutasaddi of Surat to do any thing without the permission of the latter. See EF (1630-33), p.99; Letters Received, II, p.261.

5. See the sources cited for farming.

that whenever the nāib-mutasaddis got an opportunity, they not only misused their authority but also could embezzle government money. I'timād Khān, the nāib mutasaddi of Cambay in the absence of Amānat Khān, who was the mutasaddi both of Sūrat and Cambay, was reported to have practised many abuses and embezzled Rs. 1345 from the revenue of the Gogha port. The man in question was dismissed from service.[1]

Other officials at the port, working under the mutasaddi, were the mushrif-i-farza-o-khushki, tahwīldār, dārogha-i-khizāna, and muaim appointed directly from the Imperial headquarters.[2] They were the clerks of the customhouse who assisted the customer to dispose of the customhouse business.[3] From the Mirāt it appears that the above officials were common both for farza and khushki.[4] They collected custom dues, kept the treasury and maintained custom registers, both in Persian and Baniāni,[5] in which the daily accounts of goods and passengers passed, the amount collected on account of customs and other items of

1. Mirāt, I, p.382.

2. Mirāt (Suppl.), pp. 183,223; Akhbārāt, document 1804, dated 23th Jumāda I, 25th year of Aurangzeb.

3. Thevenot, pp. 3, 38; EF (1618-21), p.232.

4. Mirāt, op.cit.

5. EF (1630-33), pp. 153-154.

income and expenditure were entered.[1] These officials could also be engaged in searching and checking goods;[2] and at times their help could be sought for valuation of goods and assessment of custom.[3] The _dastak_ (_dākhilāi rawāī mahsūl_) certifying that the custom on goods, intended to be carried into the country had been paid, used to be issued by them. The _dastak_ bore the seals of the _mutasaddī_, the _mushrif_, the _tahwīldār_ and the signature of the _muqīm_.[4]

There used to be another _dārogha_ who had for his charge the purchase of horses, for royal use, imported from Arabia and Iraq.[5]

The waiters, porters and poons mentioned by the Europeans were called _piyādas_.[6] A large number of them was engaged by the government on its account,[7] while others were hired by the

1. _Ibid._, p. 116.
2. Thevenot, p.3.
3. _Ibid._
4. _Mirāt_ (Suppl.), p.194.
5. MS. Fraser 124, f. 96ab; _Mirāt_ (Suppl.), p.223.
6. Thevenot, p.38. According to him they were 'Moors' (Muslims).
7. According to the _Akhbārāt_, document No. 2036, dated 19th Shawwāl, 26th year 'Alamgīrī, previously the number of the _piyādas_ on government pay roll was 6000. In the year noted above it was raised to 9000.

passengers and merchants.[1] They performed different jobs, some of them acted as watchmen inside the customhouse, at gates and in the harbour,[2] while many others were employed to bring the men and goods on their backs, from the deck to the customhouse.[3]

Besides the officials and the *piyādas* mentioned above, the other officers referred to at the port were : the *sadr*, the *qāzī* , the *Kotwāl*, the *muhtasib*, the *waqāʼinavis*, the *sawānihnavis* and the *harkāra*; a large number of *dāroghas* to work in various *mahāls* (or *bāzārs*), to act at the court (*ʻadālat*) to supervise public work, purchase, stores kept in the fort, poor relief department, hospital, garden and the presents annually sent the Mecca and Madina; the *amīn* to control expenses etc.These officials had duties similar to those that have been described elsewhere in connection with the administrative arrangements in the towns other than sea-ports. They were variously appointed by the *dīwān-i ʻalá*, the *mīr ātish*, the chief *sadr* and *dārogha-i dāk*. In theory it appears that the above were intended to be independent of the *mutasaddī* but in practice they had to work under him.[4]

---

1. Thevenot, pp. 1-2.
2. *Ibid.*, p.3.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.
4. For the above mentioned officials, see *Mirāt* (Suppl.) pp. 222-223; see also *Ibid.*, p.183; Ms. Fraser, 124, f. 74b.

CUSTOMHOUSE (FARZA):

The farza constituted a fiscal division (mahal) under the mutasaddi.[1] Here goods and passengers were searched, their dastaks checked[2] and custom on merchandise realized by the mir bahr or shāhbandar.[3] The walled enclosure which housed the mahal was situated close to the landing point. It was called customhouse and by other names by the Europeans.[4] Each port had one farza. It usually had two gates: one great gate and the other a smaller one. The former opened towards the sea and had a broad and spacious court yard in front, while the latter opened into the bāzār.[5]

When a boat or ship approached the customhouse, it was stopped in knee-deep water by signals given out by the custom officials.[6] The passengers and their goods were carried ashore by porters.[7] The passengers alongwith their goods were then

---

1. Mirāt (Suppl.), p.194.

2. Letters Received, IV, p.320; Finch, Early Travels, pp.134-135; P.D.Valle, p.23; Fryer, I,pp. 247-248; Hamilton, p.321; Manrique, II, p.236.

3. Mirāt (Suppl.),op.cit.

4. The customhouse has been variously called the 'Alfandica' see Letters Received, IV,p.320; Finch, Early Travels, pp. 134-135; the 'Dogana' see, P.D.Valle, p.23; and the 'Choquidar' see, Manrique, II,p.236. The Persian historians use the word 'Farza' see, Mirāt (Suppl.) pp.194,222,223; Ms. Fraser, 124, f.101b.

5. Thevenot, p.3; Hawkins, Early Travels, p.63.

6. Thevenot, pp.1-3. When any ship approached the bar, it too was required to give signals of its arrival by gun-shots. See The Abbe Carre, I, p.166.

7. Thevenot, pp. 1-3.

led to the large court-yard and thence to the big hall of the custom house where the actual search was carried out.[1] The custom house usually never opened before ten in the morning and the search of passengers and their baggage continued till noon.[2] The passengers entered one after another.[3] The clerks at the instance of the chief customer (mutasaddī) or shāhbandar wrote down the particulars of the passengers person as well his goods in a register; he was then thoroughly searched.[4] The passenger had to take off his cap or turban, his girdle, shoes stoching and clothing. Every part of the body was looked into. His goods were turned over several times and everything was ripped open.[5] This vigorous search usually took more than a quarter of an hour per person.[6] This done, and having paid custom for gold and silver, the passenger was allowed to go. But he could not carry his goods or luggage, if any, at that time: for these he had to come the next day.[7] This was because the goods

---

1. Ibid.
2. Thevenot, p.3; Pietro Della Valle, I, p.23.
3. Thevenot, p.3.
4. Ibid.
5. Thomas Roe refers to the "custom of the king's officers to search every thing that came ashore, even the pockets of mans clothes on their backs for customs." The Embassy, pp. 28-29; Pietro Della Valle; I, pp. 23-24; Tavernier, I, p.7; Thevenot, p.4; Hamilton, p.321.
6. Thevenot, p.4.
7. Ibid.; Pietro Della Valle, I, pp. 126-127.

once brought into the custom house could not be delivered until the king's seal was stamped on it.[1] Before getting out of the customhouse, the passenger was once again checked by the guard of the smaller gate and the latter would not let him go unless the Shāhbandar gave permission.[2]

The passengers could be allowed to come ashore if the customhouse was still open.[3] Otherwise, those arriving late had to wait aboard the vessel, heavily guarded, till 10 a.m. the next day.[4] Immediately after a ship approached the bar, the master of the ship was obliged to come ashore in his own boat to acquaint the custom authorities with the ship's arrival and to give a statement of her cargo and passengers aboard.[5] The master was himself subjected to thorough search;[6] and immediately a waiter' (so called by the English factors) was sent to aboard the vessel to prevent the passengers from breaking the bulk packages and carrying away anything or putting up aboard another

---

1. Van Den Broeke, pp.
2. Thevenot, p.3; Pietro Della Valle, I, pp. 126-127.
3. Thevenot, p.3.
4. Manrique, II, p.236; Manrique at Thaṭṭa had to pass the whole night aboard and it was only the next morning that he was allowed to land. His ship reached Thaṭṭa in the late hours when every body of the customhouse was gone.
5. Thevenot, p.2.
6. Ibid.

ship that had already been searched.[1] In the meantime, if enough time was left for closing the customhouse, several boats could be sent to bring men and goods ashore.[2]

When the custom house was opened, a large number of waiters (peons or piyādas) were seen there.[3] Some of them kept watch from the covered pavillion over all who went in and came out of the barks.[4] Others led passengers on to the quay one by one, while they themselves, cane in land, kept standing on both sides of the passage making lane for the passengers to pass through.[5] Their main purpose was to keep the newly arrived passengers away from the people of the city lest the latter might convey any kind of message to the former.[6] If despite this strictness, anyone tried to approach the new-comers, he was liable to be flogged, and fined.[7]

EVASION OF CUSTOM:

Evasion of custom by fraud was a very common practice at the ports.[8] If "they (merchants) who have a mind to conceal

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
3. Thevenot, p.2.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., pp. 2-3.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. EF (1630-33), pp. 153-4, 116, 187.

anything, and defraud the custom house", says Thevenot, "order their affairs more truely (much earlier), they stay not till they come to Sūrat, there to beg the assistance of their friends. I have known some bring in a great many precious stones, and other jewels, which the officers of the custom-house never saw, nor got one fartherring by."[1] But those who were caught at it were severely punished.[2] For officers, if any of them was found party to it, death was the only recourse.[3] Fryer mentions the "punishment being corporal, not confiscation of goods."[4] However the practice could hardly be rooted out.[5]

MAHĀL JAHĀZĀT:

The mahāl jahāzāt[6] dealt with the coming and going of ships (āmad u raft-i jahāzāt), anchor (langar), collection of

---

1. Thevenot, p.3.
2. EF (1624-29), p.163.
3. Ibid. (1665-67), p.9.
4. Fryer, I, pp. 247-48.
5. Reporting the incapability of the custom officials to check evasion the English Factors from Sūrat wrote to the company, "scarce a yeare passes but some of these merchants are loosers by these practices (fraud) and yet they will not suffer their gold to go into the custom house if they can help it, although they bring many hundred thousand pounds from Bussra, Persia and the Red Sea yearly. And this the governor and all know yet they are not molested for it." See EF (1665-67), p.9.
6. For mahāl jahāzāt at Cambay. See MS. Fraser 124, f.94a. For Sūrat, Ibid., f. 123a.

anchor fee (haq-i langar) and insurance (bima) of goods and passengers. The notable officials in this mahal were darogha-i-jahazat, mushrif, tahwildar and amin etc.[1] The bakhshi wa waqainavis kept record of the ships.[2]

The rates of anchor fee are not mentioned.[3] However in an English Factors letter from Bombay it is stated to be ½%.[4]

According to Ms. Fraser 124, the rates of insurance through which a considerable income used to come to Imperial treasury, were: From passengers they charged 1 rupee per head. On boats carrying merchandise from Cambay to Gogha or vice versa they took a lump sum Rs.25 to 30 per boat. For the boats operating between Broach, Daman, Chakli, Nausari and Gundevi the fee was Rs. 7 to 10 per boat. These rates are specifically mentioned for the trade between one port and another and between one bara (small port) and another bara

---

1. See Ibid., f. 96ab; Akhbarat, document No. 1804, dated 23 Jumada I, 25th year of Aurangzeb.

2. Akhbarat, document No. 706, dated 29th Rajab, 44th year of Aurangzeb.

3. The right to levy and collect haq-i langar has been mentioned in a number of documents. See Farman, Nishan and Parwana, MS. Add. 24039, document No.10, copy of the Parwana of Mirza Muhd. Hayat Nazim suba Orissa, dated 18th Safar, 1069 A.H., Ibid., document No.17, copy of the Parwana of Nawab Narpat Khan Nazim suba Orissa, dated 9th Shawwal, 11th year 'Alamgiri; Ibid., document No.22, copy of the Parwana Nawab Rasid Khan Nazim suba Orissa, dated Ist Rabi II, 17th year of 'Alamgiri etc.

4. EF (1670-77), p.159.

on the western coast.[1] We do not know about the rates between distant ports. However, according to the above MS., similar rates were prevalent at other ports also.[2]

CUSTOM:

The official rate for the custom charges at all ports in theory remained 2½% on all goods imported or exported, except bullion which paid only 2%. The merchants, however, actually had to pay more in practice. According to the Āīn, the custom duty did not exceed 2½%.[3] Jahāngīr is reported to have similarly warned that it should not be more than one in forty (or 2½%).[4] William Finch, who arrived at Sūrat in 1608, found that custom amounted to "two and half for goods three for victualls, and two for money."[5] But subsequent statements suggest that sometime in the year 1611-12 custom charges were increased to 3½%,[6] in the name of customer's brokage[7] or dastūrī.[8]

---

1. See MS. Fraser, 124, ff. 439b 440a.
2. Ibid.
3. Āīn, I, p.204.
4. Tuzuk, pp. 206-207.
5. Finch, Early Travels, p. 134, Purchas, IV, p.28.
6. Thomas Best, who came to Sūrat in 1612, says that an agreement was made and according to that, "all English commodities shall pay custom, according to the value or price that it beareth at the time that it is put into the custom house, after the rate of three and half the hundred." <See Purchas, IV, p.126>. Pelsaert, visiting India during the later years of Jahāngīr says that "custom duties are here three and an half per cent on all imports and exports and two per cent on money either gold or silver." <See Pelsaert, p.24>. The earlier letters of the English Factors also confirm that custom charges at Sūrat were three and half per cent. <See Letters Received, III, p.5; EF (1624-29), p.92>.

Contd.....

The rate of 3½% continued up to 1664. It was only in this year that, following Shivāji's attack on Sūrat, Aurangzeb reduced custom duty by ½% for the Dutch and the English as a mark of favour on account of their services to the defense of the port. Later on, the reduction was made applicable to other merchants also.[1] But it is significant that the reduction was made only in the official rate i.e. from 2½% to 2%. The levy of 1% more in the name of dastūrī however continued.[2] Two years later (in 1666), in order to make the custom rates uniform throughout the empire on all goods, Aurangzeb fixed the duty at 2½% on goods belonging to Muslims and 5% on Hindus.[3] The European were to pay 3½% and the Harbī 4%.[4]

(Continued from the previous page)

7. According to another English Factors letter from Sūrat dated 1616 it was reported that although official rate stood at 2½ per cent they (custom officials) charged one per cent more for customers brokage and in this levy the natives were exempted. The above Factors wrote, "In this examination we had in question our customer and find that the inhabitants pay 2½% custom and no other duty; the Portugals and all other strangers, besides the said custom, do pay one per cent extorted, which they call the customers brokage." Letter's Received, IV, p.331; EF (1624-29), p.92.
8. All the Europeans took great object to the increase of the custom by 1%. Pieter Van Den Broeke, for example, wrote in 1628 from Sūrat thus, "July, on 26th, the custom authorities wanted to establish a new practice or usage, with us and the English, viz, a dastūrī, or compliment, of one per cent on all our imports and exports, to which we absolutely refused to consent." (p.2).

1. EF (1661-64), pp. 314-315.
2. Ibid. (1665-67), p.315.
3. Mirāt, I, pp. 258-259.
4. Ibid.(Suppl.), pp. 179, 182.

In 1667 the Dutch and a little later the English sought a reduction in the rate of custom.[1] Their requests were granted and custom was lowered from 3½ to 2%.[2] But from the letters of the English factors it appears that the above reduction was a short lived measure. For, when again pressed by heavy custom demand by the port officials, Aungier, the English president at Sūrat (1676), decided, in consultation with his council and on the advice of the principal merchants, that the general rate should be fixed at 3½% including 1% voluntary contribution towards the fortification of the port.[3] This was agreed to by the government and for the rest of Aurangzeb's reign, this rate remained in force.[4]

Three documents belonging to the reign of Muhammad Shah - one farmān-i ʿālā dated 4th Safar 6th regnal year,[5] second a hasbul hukm with the seal of Syed ʿAbdullāh Khān Bahādur Zafar Jáng dated 9th Zilhijja, 5th year[6] and the third parwānah-i tasdiq muāfi Qamar al Dīn Khān Muhammad Shāhī dated

1. EF (1665-67), pp. 273-274.
2. Ibid., (1668-69), pp. 35, 116, 228.
3. Ibid., New Series (1670-77), p.119.
4. The Diary of William Hedge, I, p.101.
5. For the text of the above farmān see MS. Fraser 228,ff. 20b, 21ab, 22ab, 23a.
6. For the text of the Hasbul Hukm see Ibid., ff. 27b, 28ab.

14th Rajab, 7th year[1] affirm that the custom charges at Sūrat, Hugli and other ports from the time of Hazrat Khuld Manzil (Aurangzeb) and Hazrat Khuld Makān (Bahādurshāh) and also in the reign of Muhammad Shāh were two and half per cent. Two of these documents further corroborate that the Europeans, however paid 3½ per cent.[2]

It can thus be safely said that throughout our period and upto the first quarter of the 18th century, the minimum custom rates remained two and half per cent on all goods excepting bullion which only paid two per cent. But the officers of the custom house on spot could charge more than the scheduled customs under one pretext or the other. Sometimes they charged one per cent in the name of the customers brokage or dasturi.[3] On other occasions they demanded one per cent more to pay for the fortification of the port.[4] Still the third excuse which they adopted (after 1680) was to force the merchant to pay 1½% more in lieu of jiziya. Although the English and all other merchants who were subject to the

---

1. This document is known as Sūrat Document in possession of Seminar Library, History Department AMU Aligarh. For the text and English tr. see the paper 'The Custom House at the Port of Surat During the Seventeenth Century' by the present writer, Pub. Studies in Islam, Jan.-October 1971, New Delhi, pp. 167-69.

2. The farmān and Hasbūl Hukm cited above n. 1 & 2.
3. Pieter Van Den Broeke, p.2; Letters Received, IV, p.331; EF (1624-29), p.92.
4. EF, New Series, (1670-77), p.119.

imposition of *jiziya*, on paper were given to understand that they paid only 2%, in practice they had to pay 3½%.[1]

CUSTOM COLLECTION:

The custom (*mahsūl*) on imports and exports was fixed by the government but the privilege of collecting it might either be retained in *khālisa* or assigned in *jāgir* or given out on *ijāra*.[2] Of these three forms, farming needs a few comments.

---

1. See MS. Add. 24039, *Farmān, Nishān & parwāna*, document Nos. 32, copy of the '*parwāna Amir ul Umarā Nāzim sūba Bengāl*' dated, 6th Muharram, 24th year 'Ālamgiri, 33, copy of the '*Parwāna Hāji Shafi Khān diwān sūba Bengāl*' dated 19th Jumāda II, 24th year 'Ālamgiri; 35B, '*Hasbul Hukm Kifāyat Khān*' dated 21st Jumāda II, 24th year 'Ālamgiri.
"Aurangzebs imposition of a poll-tax (*jiziya*)", wrote the English Factors from Sūrat (1680), "continued to be a source of trouble. The English, French and Dutch at Surat had strongly objected to its levy, but in April (1680) orders were received from the Emperor that, instead of the poll-tax, the European nations should pay 3½ per cent customs on goods at Surat, as they used to. This was a serious increase from the rate of 2 per cent, which had been in force since 1667 (*EF 1665-7*), pp. 273-4, and Rolt estimated that it would cost the company about Rs. 20000 a year." *EF (1678-84)*, pp. 255-56; See also *Ibid.*, pp. 275, 295.

2. According to Khwāja Yasin, "ijāra is an Arabic word. Anybody who holds places on ijāra, the gain or loss is his responsibility. He should send the money of the government in instalments. None of his excuses will be heard. If there is a condition written in the agreement, he could make the repersentation according to that" f.48b. In Purnea MS. of the above 'Glossary' the version is slightly different. The ijara is identified with théka (Hindi word for contract) and the contractor was bound to deposit the money agreed to the government without fail. However, in case of draught and flood he could represent to the government, f.45b. For a

Contd.....

Farming prevailed both in the Khālisa[1] and the jāgīrs.[2] The practice was, however, disapproved by the government.[3] It appears that the repeated loss of custom revenue collected in successive years under direct management led to farming-out of the customs. In some cases, the farm was given out, if a bid was offered higher than the actual amount collected previously.[4]

The farmer was concerned only with the custom dues and its collection. He could not interfere in the general administration of the port unless vested with delegated powers over certain matter or when he himself was both the farmer and the mutasaddī. In fiscal matters he, however, wielded considerably

---

(Continued from the previous page)

similar condition laid down in an ijāra agreement for qasba Muhammadpūr, sūba Mālwa. See Mutafarriq Mahārājgan, Bundle Nos. 3, document No.431, dated 28th Rajab, 1117 A.H. See also Allāhābād Documents, Nos.884,885,886,887,889,890 etc.

1. Twice the port of Sūrat was farmed out from direct management. Once in 1636-38 to Hakīm Masīhuzzamān, see. EF (1634-36) pp. XV,189, Ibid (1637-41),p.279; and second in 1639-41 to Mīr Mūsa. See Ibid (1642-45), pp.23-24; For Gogha, see MS. Fraser 124, f.472b. For muqtaʿ of Sūrat on payment of Rs.7 lākhs a year, see Ibid., f. 187b.

2. Cambay was held in jāgīr by Nūr Jahān but the right of ~~xxxx~~ custom collection was farmed out to Safī Khān. See EF (1622-23), p.249. For ijāra given out of jāgīr see also Mazhar-i Shāhjahānī, pp. 164,165; Pelsaert, p.64.

3. ʿAhkām-i ʿĀlamgīrī, f. 207ab.

4. EF (1637-41), p.123.

wide powers and tried to collect as much amount as he could. So that, after paying the amount of the bid, he would have a sizable balance of profit. He did not naturally consider the merchant's convenience. His main concern was collecting the amount of the bid and his profit.[1]

It was for this reason that merchants preferred direct administration with regard to the business in custom house and mint. However, direct administration entailed unnecessary delay in clearance and other troubles.[2]

The farmer could be dismissed even before the expiry of the period of contract, first for not paying the amount of the bid in time or at the complaint of merchants;[3] or he could be ousted through the machinations of another farmer who promised still a higher bid.[4]

---

1. Mīr Mūsa, during his term as farmer tried his best to amass money by all means. Reporting this the English Factors wrote to the company that, "in your customes you are exceedingly injured, and not you only, but the Dutch, yea, all other merchants, whose this governor, Mazel Mulcke, makes no scruple to rate at double their cost, thinking by this means to raise the sum he covenanted to pay the king, which more than double exceed what his predecessor agreed for. Besides which force exercised in the matter of customes, he practizeth another more prejudicial than the former.....he taketh on each maund of goods sometimes two, three, yea, four rupees, according as they are in value." See EF (1637-41)279; see also Ibid (1646-5), p.69.

2. The exit of Mīr Mūsa as farmer was rejoiced by everybody specially the merchants. See EF (1642-45), pp.23-24.
3. Ibid (1637-41), p.XVI.

4. Ibid., p.123. Mīr Mūsa promised to pay 200,000 mahmūdīs more than Masīhuzzamān annually paid.

ABUSES IN PORT ADMINISTRATION:

Our sources refer to a number of abuses perpetrated by the mutasaddis. The main complaint against them was of over-valuing the goods and thereby inflating the rates of custom on goods passing through the custom house.[1] The schedules were ad valorem, but while the rates were fixed by superior authority, the valuation of goods was left to the discretion of the officials on the spot, who could, if they chose, double their demand by doubling the value.[2] Secondly, the mutasaddi or the customer (Shāhbandar) could delay the clearance of the goods from the customhouse; and this put them in a position not merely to extort bribes but also to make profit by forced dealings i.e. forcing the merchants to sell their goods at the

---

1. Letters Received, III, p.5; Ibid., IV, pp. 78-81; EF (1618-21); p.110; Ibid., pp. 187-88; Finch, Early Travels, p.127. The Dastak Diyānat Khān Alamgiri, in History Department, A.M.U. Aligarh. The text with Eng.tr. of the dastak has been published by the present writer in an Appendix to the paper. The custom house .... in the Journal Studies in Islam, Jan.-Oct. 1971, New Delhi, pp.153-54. In the above dastak it is referred that Muhammad Fāzil, son of Hājī Hāmid, merchant of the port of Sūrat, through a petition brought it to the notice of Imperial headquarters that "mutasaddis ([redacted]) of the customhouse of the port of Sūrat .... assess the prices of goods and articles above the price current." The mutasaddi Diyānat Khān thereupon was asked to acertain the above fact and to report back in details.

2. The practice of over-valuing the goods in the customhouse was very common at Sūrat. Reporting this the Eng.Factors from the above port wrote, "Here the governors will is a law; so that he setts what prices be pleaseth on commodities, that thereby it cometh to pass that while you think you pay but 3½ per cent, your customs stands you in twice as much, for the goods are ~~so~~ often rated at double the price, they cost as was that indico he bought in Āgra, which costing 61 rupees for maund was here rated by Mazel Mulk at 110

Contd.....

prices offered by the former, and to steal the choicest goods which the merchant could not detect upto the time the goods were finally delivered out of the custom house.[1] Incidentally, it may be noted here that many of the mutasaddis had private trade of considerable volume;[2] and they often misused their official status to inflate the balance of profit. In one instance, the

---

(Continued from the previous page)

rupees, because (he said) it was worth so much in Persia. But at Bandar Lares (Lahori bandar) it is not so; for there the prices are known and sett down in a rate book, not to be innovated or altered at every covetous or unjust Governor's will." EF (1622-23), p.244.

1. The English Factors from Sūrat (1616) complaining against the detaintion of their good in thecustom house wrote, "the governor and customer do (detain) goods into the custom house, lay aside the choicest and principal wares so brought and send them into their houses without making price with the merchants....(if ever payment be made) it shall be very under rates and less than they cost, or in the best fashion, the opinion of the Sabindour shall be taken. If the appraise them at far under rates it must not be denied, or else he should be forced to take what he doth offer them." See Letters Received, IV, p.79; EF (1618-21), p.319; Ibid. (1655-60), pp. 312-313.

2. Muqarrab Khān was a great trader, See Letters Received, I, p.307. For the private trade of Mirzā Ishāq Beg See, EF (1622-23), pp.149,150,168. While Ishāq Beg was mutasaddi his younger brother, Pir Shora, carried very large trade with the English, Ibid. Mirzā Jamshed Beg traded with the English, Ibid., p.78. For the lead monopoly of mutasaddi see Ibid. (1624-29), pp. 106,307. Mir Mūsa trading with the English see Ibid., (1630-33), pp. 26,27,131,194,246,256, 277,285; Ibid.,(1634-36), p.62. His lending money to the English, Ibid., p.68. Monopoly of lead trade, Ibid., pp.69, 143; Ibid. (1637-41),pp.183,204,208,253,288. His Masih-uzzamān's trade with the English, Ibid.,(1637-41), p.98; purchasing lead both from the English and the Dutch, Ibid. Mirzā Arab during his term of office lent money to the English and earned huge profit, Ibid.,(1655-60), p.210.

the _mutasaddī_ forbade the purchase of bullion and silver by the _sarrāfs_ of the city (Sūrat) and himself monopolized it and drew large profits.[1] In the _dastak_ noted above (n), in addition to the over-valuation, it was also stated that "the custom officials (_mutasaddīyān-i farza_) at Sūrat while valuing the goods estimate the value in _Ibrāhīmī_ and in _riāls_ but take the custom in rupees and do not charge the custom (_ushr_) as share in kind of each specie of coins."[2]

Thus, taking into account the over-valuation, unnecessary detention and forced purchase, it would appear that the actual schedules of custom might have been much less in comparision to the demand which often had to be met with in practice Goods could not normally be delivered out of the customhouse, says Fryer, "till a right understanding be created betwixt the _Shāhbandar_ and them (the merchants) which commonly follows when the first is mollified."[3] Sometimes for a speedier despatch, almost double the custom or bribe had to be paid and the merchants used to suffer it patiently.[4]

---

1. See _EF (1634-36)_, pp. 68-69; _Ibid_, (1661-64), pp. 76-77. The Shiqqdār and the Kotwāl were forced to purchase indig. at Broach for mutasaddī. _Ibid_, (1618-21), p.307.
2. The _dastak_, op.cit.
3. Fryer, I, pp. 247-248. The English Factors reported from Sūrat (1621), "It is evident that the goods for England cannot be cleared from the custom house without bribe, it is resolved that the value of Mahmūdīs 600 in cloth should be given to the customer, Mahmūdīs 300 in like commodities to the cheefa serivan (writer), Mahmūdīs 200 in money amongst writers and other officers." _EF (1618-21)_, pp. 317-18; Ibid (1630-33), p.326.
4. Finch, _Early Travels_, p.127; _Letters Received_, III, p.270; _Ibid._, IV, p.80; _EF (1618-21)_, p.101; Ibid (1630-33), p.226.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I

In view of the simplified theories of Mughal-Indian urban life which have held the day for so long, insisting that the towns then were either few, or, only military camps, it has been necessary for us, first, to examine the nature and size of the towns of our period. We have seen that the factors leading to the rise and growth of individual towns were complex; and any classification on the basis of functions that a town mainly performed must take into account not one or two but a number of categories.[1] As examples, and not as comprising an exhaustive list of such possible categories, we have offered the following : Administrative centres; marts with access to raw material from the country around to ensure a permanent manufacturing character;[2] position on navigable river or land route; port; possession of religious sanctity, place of pilgrimage; possession of strategic situation, on hill, pass or border, contributing to its military as well as commercial importance.[3] Sometimes more than one factor could combine to account for the rise and growth of a town. But generally speaking it may be said that whatever the origin of towns it was the industries and following them the trade

---

1. See Chapter I, pp. 3-15.

2. See an unpublished paper of the present writer, Rural Basis of Urban Crafts', read at the Seminar on Medieval Economy and Colonization, held at Aligarh March 1972.

3. Chapter I, pp. 3-15.

which guaranteed their continued existence and stimulated their further growth. There are examples of towns which started and developed as administrative centres but did not die out when they ceased to function as such, owing to their having acquired position as industrial centres or marts.[1]

For location in case of majority of towns proximity to a river, which ensured continued water supply throughout the year and facilitated transport, was always an important factor. The towns which did not have river bedding had large tanks or reservoirs for the supply of water. A majority of the towns for defence were encircled by outer walls made either of mud or stone and accompanying with deep trenches. Within the wall some kind of planning is discernible in the position assigned to the fort or town-citadel, houses of nobles, bāzārs, residential quarters of merchants, craftsmen, urban professional and labourers, places of worship, sarāis and huts of menials etc. The gardens, burial, cremation ground and slaughter house were usually laid out side the wall.[2]

The absence of reliable census data with regard to the urban population prevents any conclusion in quantitative

---

1. See Marx, Pre-Capitalist Economic Formation, ed. E.J. Hobsbawm, pp. 77-78, for undifferentiated unity of town and country (village) in Asian countries which led to the longer survival of both.

2. Chapter I, pp. 16-34.

terms. It is however probable that urban population must have accounted for a high ratio of the total population of the empire. Out of the total urban population, the artisans and labourers easily formed the majority. The army, the bureaucrats and the merchants also must have been in substantial number. It is not surprising that a number of travellers during 17th century saw towns in the provinces of Gujarāt and Bengāl (areas most frequently visited by them) as full of weavers, dyers, bleachers and labourers.[1]

II

The administration of town had to have two aspects to deal with : First, the general administration which comprised the maintenance of law and order inside the town or around it; prevention of crime; defence, justice, control of markets, supply and prices; water supply; sanitation and other municipal functions. Secondly, the fiscal administration i.e. collection of taxes on sales and other transactions, and realisation of revenue from other sources.

For general administration, the town was governed by two sets of officials i.e. those who had administrative responsibility inside the town and those around it. Every town of a reasonable size was administered by a Kotwāl who had very wide responsibilities. His duties broadly comprised: watch and ward, supervision of public conduct and prevention of crime;

1. Chapter I, pp. 35-47.

care and legitimate disposal of property of persons dying intestate, prevention of social abuses; regulation of supply of provision and water etc., arrangements for cremating and burying the dead, regulation of the slaughter-house, control over market and prevention of illegal exactions.[1] He presided over the chabutra-i-kotwali which besides housing his office and residence served a number of purposes. It was there that the punishment in various criminal cases was executed at the chabutra. It was used as a prison (bandikhana) where prisoners just apprehended or undergoing trial were kept; and lastly it constituted a fiscal division (known as mahal chabutra-i-kotwali) where, particularly in ordinary towns, market dues, fines and other taxes were levied and collected.[2]

In internal administration, another official who shared some of the duties of the kotwal was muhtasib. He became important under Aurangzeb (1689-1707). His main duty was the censorship of public morals particularly for Muslims, but he performed certain other civic functions as well, examining weights and measures, checking commodities brought for sale, preventing the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicants, recording prices of commodities sold and purchased and watching that roads were clear and checking unauthorized occupation of portion of roads, etc.

---

1. See Chapter II, pp. 53-63; See also P. Saran, p. 233.
2. Ibid., pp. 68-80.

The officials who were expected to maintain law and order around the town were : faujdār, qilʿadār, thānadār and rāhdār. The first two commanded the local militia and were responsible for defending the town, protecting the roads leading to and from thecity; helping to regulate the supply of grain and other commodities by extending protection to merchants and banjāras and checking thefts and dacoities. In the internal administration of the town, they could not normally interfere. The authority of the qilʿadār did not extend beyond the four walls of the fort, but in order to apprehend and check the irregularities in town administration, he could post his secret agents throughout the city and send separate reports to the headquarters based on the findings of his men. The qilaʿ or fort not only usually housed the royal treasury, stores of grain etc., but also served as state prison for keeping prisoners. It also provided shelter to the town people in times of danger.

For the smooth running of administration, the two kinds of officials mentioned above, were required to work in close co-operation. But all being appointed direct from the headquarters, they were independent of each other; and perhaps therefore, a system of checks and balances was also intended. Their right to communicate local intelligence independently to their superiors was further intended to ensure that the government was free from the necessity of reliance upon one man or one official alone.

The special agencies through which the government obtained news were : the waqāinavis, the savānihnavis, the khufianavis and the harkāra collectively known as akhbārnavis. These officials were posted through out the empire : at the Imperial capital, the headquarters of provinces, sarkārs and parganas, at Chabutra-i-kotwālī, market places, forts and around the cities. They submitted reports of all events and happenings. Their reports were both written and oral and were sent at daily, weekly and monthly intervals. Besides furnishing the Imperial government with actual news, they were required to report on the abuse of authority, collection of illegal taxes, oppression and tyranny restored to by the town officials. In addition to the above, the government could also depute special couriers to look into the complaints and allegation levelled against the local officials either through petitions from local people, or by one official against another or by the local waqāinavis. There are numerous instances when the local officials were dismissed, transferred and punished by reduction in mansab and post, imprisoned etc. as a result of the findings of the reporters.[1]

For the administration of justice, the city or town had a court of the qāzī known as Dārulqazā to which the

1. See Chapter III, pp. 114-119.

inhabitants carried their criminal, civil, mercantile and religion disputes. While the duty of the Kotwāl and the muhtasib was to detect the offence and apprehend the offender, it was the qāzi who investigated the accusations, examined witnesses and other evidence and pronounced judgement. Normally, in case of a criminal offence, the accused was caught and brought in fetters to the qāzis court by the Kotwāl on his own initiative; but the qāzi too could directs the kotwāl to apprehend the alleged offender, if he himself received accusations against that person. For decision in various cases, the qāzi was required to follow the rules of the Sharíat or Muslim Law. In many cases, he, however, could frame his decision by following judgements passed by other qāzis in similar cases. Still in other cases much depended on witness, evidence and the discretion of the qāzi.

In theory, the judicial system was kept independent of the local administration and it was for this reason that the qāzis were appointed direct from the Imperial headquarters and were directed to impart justice without interference from the local officials. The qāzi was also expected to check corruption, abuse of authority and tyranny by local officials. The oppressed people generally looked to the qāzi for justice; and when he found himself incompetent to deal with a particular complaint, he could communicate it the headquarters. There are large number of cases when local officials were punished

upon the report of the qāzīs.

Notwithstanding this, in practice the judgement of qāzīs court was far from being fair and impartial. In many cases, the qāzīs themselves were found following corrupt practices, and taking bribe from both the parties. In other cases, the qāzīs could be pressurised or won over to decide cases in favour of high officials and their favourites.[1]

For collecting the market dues and all other levies realized in cities (sāir jihāt), the markets of cities and ports and certain administrative institutions, such as mint and custom house, were constituted into several separate mahāls collectively known as mahālāt-i sāir balda. The number of mahāls in a city depended on the magnitude of commercial activities which led to the multiplicity of sources of income to the government. Big cities like Āgra, Delhi, Lāhore, Ahmadābād, Sūrat, Burhānpūr and Aurangābād might contain several mahāls with fixed annual income and constituting the entire jamadāmi of the above cities. Small towns, on the other hand, which failed to develop as centres of trade and commerce contained only one mahāl namely mahāl chabutra-i-kotwāli where the entire mahsūl-i mahāl sāir was realized.[2]

---

1. See Chapter IV, pp. 147-160.

2. Chapter V, pp. 161-64.

The articles taxed were mostly cloth, skin, food-stuff, grain, oil, ghi, sugar, medicine, drugs, tobacco, horses, camels, cows, imports and exports, bullion, silver and all other commodities which changed hands between buyer and seller. Other taxable items included shops, heirless property valuables dug up from the earth, ferry charges, forest produce, fishery, gardens, wood and fines imposed by judicial decrees.

Theoretically, the percentage of the amount realized on account of taxes under Akbar, Jahangir and Shahjahan continued at one in forty (2½%) advalorem. But during the reign of Aurangzeb the above rate was reformulated and fixed separately for Muslims, Hindus and Christians at 2½%, 5% and 3½% respectively.

The privilege of collecting the above taxes was either retained in khālisa, assigned in jāgīr or given out in ijāra.

For administering the various maḥāls and collecting taxes, if the city or town was kept under direct management, each maḥāl had a number of officials. They were : dārogha, amīn, mushrif, taḥwīldār, karora, qānūngo, mutaṣaddī. There were also a large number of piyādas. The officials were appointed by sanads from dīvān-i a'lá and at the recommendation of provincial dīvān. They received salaries, if paid in cash, from the account of the maḥāls where they worked.

Sometimes each mahāl had separate officials of its own and sometimes a single official worked in more than one mahāl either on the same or a different post. These officials were independent of the executive officials.[1]

Normally the city dues were realised at chabutra-i māl or at the place and time of purchase and sale. If a merchant had successfully evaded its payment in the market and wished to carry the commodity out of the city, he could not go unnoticed by the custom chaukis (nākas) which served as custom posts, around the city, keeping a watch over whatever was brought into or transported out of the city. The taxes collected were deposited in the royal treasury.[2]

In the towns and markets held in jāgīr, the assignee had complete control over the fiscal claims delegated to him by Imperial sanad. For the collection of taxes he employed his agents at various places in the market, and maintained custom chaukis and thānas around the city. He, however, was not allowed to exercise general administration except when such rights were specifically granted to him. In the appointment of officials such as the faujdār, qilaʿdār, qāzī, muhtasib, waqāʾinavis etc. posted in and around the town, he had no say. In certain cases however there are references of the kotwāl

---

1. Chapter V, pp. 161-67.
2. Ibid., pp. 167-68.

and the _rāhdār_ being appointed by the _jāgīrdārs_ but this right was rare and restricted to those cases alone whose assignments also included the _kotwālī_ and the _rāhdārī_ rights of the city.

With regard to the fiscal structure of the city, the _jāgīrdārs_ were not allowed to make any changes. They were however permitted to establish their ganjs (markets) but in that case it was required, by executing bonds, that the ganj established by the x _jāgīrdār_ would not compete with the already existing _ganj-i sarkārī_. Theoretically, the holder of a _qasba_ or market was entitled to collect the taxes authorized by the imperial _sanad_ at rates fixed by the government and in conformity with imperial regulations issued from time to time. But in actual practice, the _gumāshtas_ of the _jāgīrdārs_ were accused of adopting several means to extort far more than what was permitted. They could for example, enhance tax rates by over-valuing the prices of merchandise at the time of sale and purchase, at custom-house (_farza_) and at custom _chaukis_. They freely practised detention, forced purchase and engrossing in the commodities brought to the market. Moreover, the realisation of _abwāb_, although repeatedly forbidden, was practised everywhere by _jāgīrdārs_ and their agents. The state of affairs was worse in the towns or ports b lying within areas held by high officials in combined jurisdictions such as _sūbahdārī_ - and-_jāgīrdārī_ and _faujdārī_ - and - _jāgīrdārī_. Here the agents under the protection of their powerful patrons would take extortion to the

extreme limit. Nor could the situation be rectified by the *waqāi'*, or the intelligencer's reports. The high officials could bring pressure upon, or bribe the *waqāinavis* to report in their favour.[1]

The *ijāra* could be held either from the Imperial Government or the *jāgīrdār*, who might farm out the whole or a part of his assignment. In *ijāra* the main concern of the holder was the collection of amount far in excess of what he had engaged himself for. He therefore tried to collect as much amount of money as he could. In general administration, he could not interfere unless vested with certain delegated powers or when he himself was both an executive official as well as farmer. As an example, the *mutasaddī* of Sūrat, who several times held both these positions at that port, may be cited. The farmers too are widely accused of practising abuses. It was for fear of corrupt practices that whenever at Sūrat farming was superseded by direct management, merchants and others rejoiced.[2]

Of all the three systems of tax realization, namely, *khālisa*, *jāgīr* and *ijāra*, the first was most preferred. Although direct management too was never free from corrupt practices such as illegal exaction, delay in clearance of business, in the mint and the customhouse, forced purchase, engrossing and

---

1. Chapter V, pp. 169-178.
2. Chapter VIII, pp. 272-274.

other acts of tyranny and covetousness, nevertheless the merchants and the public alike felt relieved if _jāgīr_ or _ijāra_ was replaced by _khālisa_.

The transactions of business in the market between buyers and sellers were deemed to be their private affairs. But a number of irregularities in buying, selling, weighing, measuring, pricing, the cancellation of a bargain, non-payment of the amount due, monopolist's control over prices, and engrossing naturally required the existence of market administration.

Primarily the market administration had two functions: first, supervising and checking the irregularities and collecting market dues. For the former, the administration had two type of personnel. They were official and semi-official. The first included (besides the _kotwāl_, the _muhtasib_, the _waqāi'-navīs_ etc.) the _mutasaddīs_, market inspectors, price recorders and _piyādas_. These were enjoined to check irregularities, to keep watch and ward, record prices and sales, issue passes, prevent private sales outside the markets, keep daily accounts of income, and ensure low prices.[1] Secondly, there were the _chaudharī_ and the _dallāl_ who worked between the administration and the market people and received commission. The _chaudharī_, for example, had such functions as helping administration to

---

1. Chapter VI, pp. 192-195.

enforce mercantile law, watching that weight and measure were uniform, seeing that merchants did not lower or enhance prices unilaterally, assisting tax collectors etc. The *dallāl*, besides arranging a bargain, prepared *roznāmcha* containing a record of sales, market rates and other related matter. He was required to submit the above to the *kotwāl* so that the latter might be kept acquainted with the affairs in the market.[1]

Notwithstanding this, irregularities were numerous. For example, in spite of exhortations, there was little actual enforcement of price-control. Prices were often manipulated by moneyed people, merchants or high officials engaged in trade. Of course, there were certain conditions such as natural calamity, less production and difficulties of transport which could lead to price fluctuation and which the administration, could not overcome. But apart from these, the other factors, which obstructed price control, were illegal exactions, private trade of officials and such practices as monopoly, engrossing and cornering. In theory, these were forbidden and each official had to execute bonds not to indulge in them. But in fact almost every official indulged in these practices.[2]

---

1. Chapter VI, pp. 196-200.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 201-210.

There were two other administrative institutions in towns namely the mint and the customhouse from which the government drew large amount annually. The mint had twin function of minting the imported bullion, which could find its way into the country only through mint, and reminting old coins which had lost value both by age and weight. It was for those reasons that there existed mints at important ports, border towns and principal cities. The Mughal system of coinage was 'open', that is any one could bring bullion, and get it minted at a charge. This particularly explains, perhaps, the multiplicity of mints. But in practice the administration of the mint was subject to a number of abuses. To force merchants to pay over and above the mahsūl-i-dārulzarb, for example, its Superintendent (dārogha) could close down the mint, and delay the delivery of coins. He sometimes dealt in money himself, manipulating the mint out-turn to help him in his own speculations. This compelled the merchants to have their dealing with the sarrāfs who carried a very lucrative trade in currency. Significantly enough, these sarrāfs were usually supposed to be in league with the mint authorities.[1]

The customhouse (farza) which controlled the sea-borne trade was administered by a very powerful mutasaddī who had his appointment direct from the headquarters. Theoretically,

---

1. See Chapter on 'Mint', p. 239.

he was required to endeavour to collect only the legal dues, refrain from indulgence in private trade, extend welcome and protection to merchants and provide them all facilities. But in practice again things were far from ideal. The sources by and large give the impression that the affairs at the port offered ample opportunities of making unauthorized income and indulging in private trade. Most of the _mutasaddīs_ of Surat during the 17th c. were found trading with the Europeans and sending their cargoes abroad. The main charges levelled against the _mutasaddī_ and his staff were enhancing of custom rates by over-valuing goods, appropriating valuable goods from stock brought to the customhouse, delaying clearance, and compulsorily purchasing goods. Whenever the Europeans refused room to his men in their ships the customer at Surat used to confiscate their goods or harass their men in the city. To pursue the above policy even more vigrously many of them had their sons to work as customers. In other cases, while one brother was the _mutasaddī_, the other was a trader at the same port. To have been a merchant was no disqualification for holding the post of _mutasaddī_.[1]

Naturally, these practices led to loss of revenue, if markets, mint and port were retained in the _khālisa_. The government very frequently sought to counter this by having

---

1. See Chapter on 'Port administration'. see P. 245 n.2.

recourses to farming. But farming too was no solution of the problem. One may argue that the government could transfer a corrupt official or punish him by reduction in *mansab* and post by dismissal or by imprisonment. In fact in many cases this was done. But it was difficult to replace the whole staff. The complaint of the city people, in many cases, secured punishment of officials. Yet the officials were adept at using other means to minimise the complaint and escape punishment. They could mobilize their well-wishers at the court and, if necessary, bribe officials at the court. The government very well knew that Mirza Ishaq Beg and Mir Musa were corrupt *mutasaddīs*; and there were many complaints against them. Even then, each of the two was thrice appointed *mutasaddī*.[1]

III

A very important fact that emerges from our detailed evidence is that the Mughal administration in the various regions of the Empire followed a fairly uniform pattern. The officials posted in and around the town and their status and functions varied, but not so much according to regions, as to size and significance of the towns. Naturally, a big city, which contained a number of *maḥāls*, could have a multitude of custom officials, whereas a small town which had only one *maḥāl* (*chabutra-i-kotwālī*) had fewer officials. But by and large, the designations, duties and functions in various towns were the same, and they were appointed by the same procedures.

---

1. See Appendix II, pp. 307, 308, 309-10.

Secondly, the system was highly centralized. For supervision with regard to general as well as fiscal administration, smaller towns came under the jurisdiction of officers at the provincial capitals and the latter under ministers at the imperial headquarters (dārul khilāfat). Complaints from ordinary towns were carried to provincial headquarters and sometimes directly to the Emperor. Local officials had little decision making powers. Important issues before being disposed of locally had to be referred to the centre. Further, the centre kept an eye on local affairs through the intelligence department and the reports which it received from a number of local officials independently.

There was little participation of local people, or elites, in the administration of towns. Somtimes, however, the local officials invited prominent citizens for consultation. But, by and large, such cases were few and had little effect in moderating the arbitrariness of Mughal local administration.

In the working of the administration, there existed a great amount of discrepancy between theory and practice. What was deemed to be done in theory was normally not visible in practice. Corruption of all kinds deeply penetrated the Mughal administration, and was probably responsible for so corroding it from within that the collapse came none too soon.[1]

1. See Marx and Engels, 'Selected Works', Vol. I, pp. 314-315, for 'plunder of the interior', one of the department of government in Asian countries, and its crushing effect over the whole system of government if other works are neglected.

A P P E N D I X   I

ACTIVE MINT TOWNS

In the following list[1] the active mints, during the reigns of four Mughal rulers, have been arranged separately for all the three metals i.e. gold, silver and copper. The abbreviations used are : G for gold, S for silver and C for copper. Generally the mints were named after the towns. A few of them carried honorific epithets adopted by the contemporaries for a number of cities. The mint which accompanied army camp had been named Urdū or Urdū dar rāh-i dakhin.

Mint towns	Akbar (1556-1605)			Jahāngīr (1605-1628)			Shāhjahān (1628-1658)			Aurangzeb (1658-1707)		
	Gold	Silver	Copper	Gold	Silver	Copper	Gold	Silver	Copper	Gold	Silver	Copper
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Adonī	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Āgra (Akbarābād)	G	S	C	G	S	C	G	S	C	G	S	C
Ahmadābād	G	S	C	G	S	C	G	S	C	G	S	C
Ahmadnagar	x	S	X	G	S	C	x	S	x	G	S	x
Ahsanābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Ajmer	x	x	C	G	S	C	x	S	x	G	S	x
Ajmer-Salīmābād	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Akbarnagar	G	S	C	x	S	x	G	S	x	G	S	C
Akbarpūr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Akbarpūr Tānda	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
'Ālamgīrpūr	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
'Ālamgīrnagar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Allāhābād	x	S	C	x	S	x	G	S	C	G	S	x
Alwar	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Amarkot	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Anhirwālā Pattan	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ānwāla (Ānola)	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Asīr	G	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ātak												
Banāres	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Aurangābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x	G	S	x
Aurangnagar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	x	C
Awadh (Khiṭṭa)	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
A'zamnagar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	C
A'zimābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	C
Behrāich	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bāirata	x	x	C	x	x	C	x	x	C	x	x	C
Balkh	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	x	x	x	x	x
Bālāpūr	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bandar Shāhī	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bāndhū	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bangāla	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Bankāpūr	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Barār	x	S	x	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Barelī	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Bhīlsa	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x	x	S	x
Bhakkar	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	S	x
Bījāpūr	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	C
Budāon	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Burhānpūr	G	S	C	G	S	x	G	S	x	G	S	C
Chīttor	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Chunār	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Chīnāpattan	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Delhi (or Shāhjahā-nābād)	G	S	C	G	S	C	G	S	C	G	S	C
[illegible]												
Dewal Bandār	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Daulatābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x	x	x	x
Dogāon	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	C	x	x	x
Deogīr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Elichpūr	x	S	x	x	S	x	x	x	C	x	S	C
Etāwa	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G.	S	x
Fathpūr	G	S	C	G	S	x	x	S	x	x	x	x
Gadraula	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Gokāk	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Gulbarga	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	C
Golkunda	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x	G	S	x
Gūtī	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Gwāliār	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Gohad	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Govindpūr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Gorakhpūr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Haidarābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	C
Hājīpūr	G	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Hisār	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Hisār Fīroza	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Islāmābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Imtiyāz-garh	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Islām Bandar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Islāmnagar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Jahāngīr-nagar (or Dācca)	x	x	x	G	S	x	G	S	X	G	S	x
Jalesar	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Jalālnagar	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Jalālpūr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Jaunpūr	G	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Jinjī	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Junāgarh	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x	G	S	x
Kābul	x	S	C	x	S	C	G	S	x	G	S	C
Kālpī	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Kalānūr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Khairābād	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Khairpūr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Katak (Banāres)	G	S	x	x	S	x	G	S	C	G	S	C
Korā	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Kashmīr	G	x	x	G	S	x	G	S	C	G	S	x
Khambayāt	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x	G	S	x
Khujista Bunyād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Karīmābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Khairnagar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Kānjī	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Korpā	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Lāhore	G	S	C	G	S	x	G	S	X	G	S	C
Lucknow	x	S	C	x	x	x	G	S	C	G	S	C
Lāhrī Bandar	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Mālpūr	G	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Malikanagar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	x	x
Madan Kot	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Mānghar	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Mīrpūr (or Mainpur)	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Mīrtha (Merta)	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Mandū	x	x	x	G	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Multān	x	S	C	x	x	x	G	S	x	G	S	C
Muḥammadābād.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Murshidābād.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Machhlīpattan (Masulīpatam)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	C
Mānikpūr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Maḥmūd Bandar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Mailāpūr	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	C
Makhsūdābād.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Muʿazzamābād.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Murādābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Nārnol	x	S	C	x	x	C	x	x	C	G	S	C
Naṣīrābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Nuṣratābād.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Nuṣratgarh	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Nāgor (or Nagar)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	x	x
Patna	G	S	C	G	S	x	G	S	C	G	S	x
Pattan (Pattan Deo)	G	S	C	x	x	x	G	S	x	x	x	x
Peshāwar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	S	x

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Phonda	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Panjnagar	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Poonamālī	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Poona	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Pūnch	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Purbandar	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Purendā	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Qandahār	x	x	C	G	S	C	x	S	x	x	x	x
Qanamuj (Shahgarh)	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ranthor	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Rohtās	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sangamner	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Sholāpūr	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	C
Sikākul	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Sūrat	x	S	x	x	S	C	G	S	C	G	S	C
Saimūr	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Shergadh	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sitpur	G	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Srinagar	x	S	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sahāranpūr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Sarhind	G	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Sambhar (Sambhal)	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Salīmā-bād	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Sherpūr	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sironj	x	x	C	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Thaṭṭa	x	S	x	G	S	x	G	S	x	G	S	x
Toragal	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	S	x
Udgīr	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x
Ujjain (Ujjain-pūr)	G	S	C	x	S	C	G	S	C	G	S	C
Urdū	G	S	x	G	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Urdū Z.R.	G	S	C	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	x	x
Udaipūr	G	x	x	x	x	C	x	x	C	x	x	C
Urdū dar rāh-i dakhin	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ẓafarābād	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	S	x	G	S	C
Ẓafarnagar (Ẓafarapūr)	x	x	x	x	S	x	x	S	x	G	S	x
Total number of mints for each metal in each reign.	Gold 21	Silver 45	Copper 63	Gold 15	Silver 27	Copper 12	Gold 23	Silver 35	Copper 15	Gold 45	Silver 83	Copper 26
Grand total of mints in each reign.		85			32			41			87	

1. The above list of active mints together with the names of the towns after which each mint was known for the period from 1556-1707, is based more on numismatic sources and less on Persian which, except for the Āīn, very rarely mention them. The Āīn has mentioned only 42 mints. Out of which, 4 i.e. the Imperial capital, Aḥmadābād, Bengāl and Kābul issued coins in three metals; 10, namely, Allāhābād, Āgra, Ujjain, Sūrat, Delhi, Patna, Kashmīr, Lāhore, Multān and Tāṇda were common both for silver and copper, and 28 the rest viz: Ajmer, Awadh, Ātak, Alwar, Badāon, Banāres, Bhakkar, Bhera, Pattan, Jaunpūr, Jālandhār, Hardwār, Hisār Fīroza, Kālpī, Gwāliār, Gorakhpūr, Kalānaūr, Lucknow, Mandū, Nāgor, Sirhind, Siālkot, Sironj, Sahāranpūr, Sārangpūr, Sambhal, Qannauj and Ranthambhor were exclusively copper. (See Āīn, I, p.27.). Compared with the list the number given by the Āīn appears incomplete.

For preparing the above list, a large number of papers presented to the Numismatic Society of India and pub. in JASB and reprinted in Numismatic Supplement Nos. I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX to XLVII (covering the years from 1904 to 1937-38), together with JNSI from 1939 to 1970 have been examined.

Similar lists of Mughal mints have been prepared by numismatists namely, Messrs Whitehead, 'The Mint Towns of the

Mughal Emperors of India', pub. in JASB, Vol.VIII, reprinted in NS. (Numismatic Supplement) No.XI (1912), p.425; and 'First Supplement to the Mint Towns of the Mughal Emperors of India', pub. NS. No.XXV (1914), pp. 231-237; G.P.Toylor, 'List Complementary to Mr. Whiteheads "Mint Towns of the Mughal Emperors of India', Pub. NS. No. XXII (1913) pp. 178-195; S.H.Hodivala, Notes & Queries Regarding Mughal Mint-towns, pub. NS. No.XXIV (1914) 190-249 & NS. No. XXV (1914) pp. 31-97; and Historical Notes on the Honorific Epithets of Mughal Mint towns, Pub. NS. No. XXXV (1921) pp. 31-97; and /'Abūl Fazl's Inventory of Akbar's Mints, pub. NS. No.XXXIV, pp. 165-190; Brown, 'Mints of Mughals Remarks on Hodivala', pub. NS. No. XXX (1918) pp. 264-267; C.R. Singhal, 'Mint Towns of the Mughal Emperor of India', Memoir No. 4, Numismatic Society of India, pub. NS. 1, Bombay (1953) pp. 1-48; R.Burn. 'The Mints of the Mughal Emperors', Pub. JASB, LXXIII, p.75. Other works consulted are : Messrs M.K. Hussain, 'Catalogue of Coins of the Mughal Emperors', Bombay (1968), pp. I-X and 1-117; C.R. Singhal, 'Supplementary Catalogue of the Mughal Coins in the State Museum Lucknow', (1965), pp. 1-35 & 10-119; Lane-Pool, The Coins of the Mughal Emperors of Hindustān in the British Museum, ed. by R.Stuart Pool, London, 1892, pp. XLVI,XLVII, 11-55, 56-102,104-134,138-161; C.J.Rodgers, The Coins of the Mughal Emperors of India, Calcutta 1893; H.Nelson Wright, Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, Vol.III (Mughal Emperors of India),pp.xiii-LXXXII, 9-63,64-95,96-129,131-190 & Appendix B-Chronological Index, pp. 309-335, map at the end of the volume illustrating the mints of the Muhammadan Rulers.

A P P E N D I X   II

MUTASADDĪS AT SŪRAT (17th.C.)

- - -

MUQARRAB KHĀN 1608-1616

We do not know the exact date when Muqarrab Khān was appointed mutasaddī both of Sūrat and Cambay. However, when Hawkins arrived at Sūrat (August 1608) he found him in charge both of Sūrat and Cambay ports. Hawkins called him "Vice Roy of Cambay and Sūrat." See Purchas, III, p.29. Thereafter, in the English Factors' Letters he has been continuously mentioned as controlling the affairs at the two ports. See Letters Received, I, pp.23,24,26, 33,138,139,140,175-76; Ibid., II, pp. 96,138,149,150,171; Ibid., III, pp. 5,20,22,29,31,37 &c., Ibid., IV, pp.202, 292,312,313,324. He continued as governor till 1616. See Ibid., V, pp. 78,80,133; Nicholas Dawnton, p.8. In mid 1616, he succeeded 'Abdullāh Khān Fīrūz Jang as nāzim of sūba Ahmadābād. See Letters Received, VI, pp. 132,231; Mirāt, I, pp.190-191; Ma'āsir-al Umarā, III, p.380; The Embassy, p.268 &n. For various references to Muqarrab Khān, See Tuzuk (tr.) I, pp.27,144,167,215,216,255,303, 331. During his term as mutasaddī, he is reported to have indulged in private trade on a large scale. See Letters Received, I, p.307.

ZULFIQĀR KHĀN - 1616

Letters Received, IV, pp. 101,204,206,293,294,308-9,310, 324 & 335. He died the same year Ibid., V, pp.335,343.

He had been accused of detaining, over-valuing, stealing and forcibly purchasing the goods. See _Ibid._, pp.78-81.

MIRZĀ ISHĀQ BEG - 1616

He remained in Office for a few months. _Letters Received_, IV, pp. 202,347,348,349; J.Van Broeke, p.213.

IBRĀHĪM KHĀN - 1617

Letters Received, V, p.153; _Ibid._, VI, pp. 123,128,148, 149,161,211,216,17,275,302; _EF_ (1616-21), p.150.

JAMĀL KHĀN - 1618

_EF_ (1618-21), pp. 100,112,150,176. He was recalled to the court. _Ibid._, p.176.

MIRZĀ ISHĀQ BEG - 1619-21

_EF_ (1618-21), pp. 147,150.

MIRZĀ ISHĀQ BEG - Oct.1621 to Feb. 1622

_EF_ (1618-21), p.281, 320. Removed but soon reappointed _Ibid._

MIRZĀ JAMSHED BEG - Feb. 1622 to Nov. 1622

_EF_ (1622-23), p.39.

HAKĪM 'ABDULLĀH - Nov. 1622 to Sept. 1623

_EF_ (1622-23), pp. 144,265.

BAHĀDUR KHĀN - Sept. 1623 to 12th Oct. 1623

EF (1622-23), pp. Intro. XXVII & 265,276,289. Hakīm 'Abdullāh sided with Prince Khurram during latters rebellion against Jahāngīr. Bahādur Khān, the then Faujdār of Baroda, marched on Sūrat and ousted Hakīm 'Abdullāh. See Ibid. (1622-23), pp. 259,265.

SHĀDMĀN S/o KHĀN-I A'ZAM - 12th Oct.1623 to 19th Oct.1623

EF (1622-23), pp. 276,289.

BAHĀDUR KHĀN - Oct. 1623-24

EF (1622-23), pp. 282,292. Bahādur Khān was a protege of Khān-i A'zam. He appointed him at Sūrat despite the reported appointment of Muqarrab Khān to Sūrat by Jahāngīr himself.

GOVERNORS NOT KNOWN - 1624-26

During these years, the port was administered by some one from amongst the servants of Prince Perwez who held Sūrat in jāgīr. EF (1624-29), pp. 152,153,157,175,176.

GOVERNOR NOT KNOWN - 1626-29

MU'IZZUL MULK (MĪR MŪSA)-April 1629-36

EF (1624-29), p.336; Ibid., (1634-36) Intro., p.XV; Mirāt, I, p.208. In 1628, he already held the mutasaddi-garī of Cambay. See EF (1624-29), p.195. His nāib worked at Cambay. Ibid, p.99.

HAKĪM MASĪHUZZAMĀN - April 1636 to Dec.1638
(3000/500 *Mirʼāt*, I,p.210)

EF (1634-36), pp. XV, p.189; *Mirʼāt*, I,p.210. He was *mutasaddī* only of Sūrat. Mīr Mūsa who was earlier dismissed from Sūrat still held the port of Cambay ⟨ *Mirʼāt*, I, p. 204⟩. He held the port on farm. He was removed after he imprisoned Vīrjī Vohrā. *EF* (1637-41), Intro.p. XVI.

MUʼIZZUL MULK (MĪR MŪSA) - Jan. 1639 to Nov. 1641

EF (1637-41), pp. 123,207; *Mirʼāt*, I, p.212. He held the port on farming which included also the ports of Cambay and Broach. *Ibid.*, p.218.

MIRZĀ JĀM QULĪ BEG - Oct. 1641-1643

EF (1637-41), p. 305; *Ibid.* (1642-45), pp. 23,24 (n.2) 25,144; *Mirʼāt*, I, pp. 216,218: Mirzā Jām Qulī Beg for several years was the commander of Sūrat castle. Twice he officiated as *mutasaddī* in the absence of the *mutasaddī* of Sūrat ⟨ See *EF* (1618-21), pp. 120,218⟩. In 1643 he was called to the court. *Ibid* (1642-45), p.160.

SHARĀFŪDDĪN HUSAIN - Dec. 1643 to Feb. 1645

EF (1642-45), pp. 160 &n 5. Previously he was *Kotwāl* of Āgra. *Ibid.*

MIRZĀ AMĪNĀ - Feb. 1645 to Dec. 1646

EF (1642-45), p.253 & n1; *Ibid* (1646-50), p.62. He was removed from office at the complaint of the English. *Ibid.*

MIRZĀ ʿALĪ AKBAR IṢFAHĀNĪ - Jan. 1647 to 23rd Dec. 1647

(500/300, Pādshāhnāma, II, p.607; Mirāt, I, p.222).

EF (1646-50), pp. 62,84,186,196-197; Mirāt, I, pp.221-222. Murdered on private reasons. He also held Cambay. EF (1646-50), p. 196; Mirāt, I, p.223.

MUʿIZZUL MULK (MĪR MŪSA) - Jan. 1648 to Nov. 1649

EF (1646-50), pp. 206,319; Mirāt, I, p.223. Sometimes in 1643 he was appointed Dīvān of Gujarāt. Pādshāhnāma, II, p.334; Mirāt, I, op.cit. His dispute with the Dutch led to his removal. EF (1646-50), pp. 286,287.

MIRZĀ ʿARAB - Nov. 1649 to Nov. 1652

EF (1646-50), p. 319; Ibid., (1651-55), p.140; Mirāt I, p. 225.

ḤĀFIẒ MUḤAMMAD NĀṢIR - Dec. 1652 to Jan. 1656

EF (1651-54), p.140; Ibid., (1655-60), pp. 52,62; Mirāt, I, pp. 229,230. He was mutasaddī both of Sūrat and Cambay (Ibid., p.239) and inaddition held the dīvānī of Gujarāt. Removed for failure to discharge duties properly and efficiently. Mirāt, I, pp. 229,230.

MUḤAMMAD AMĪN OR (SHAIKH BUDDHAN)OR (AMĪNĀI GUJARĀTĪ) - 26 Jan. 1656 - 4 June 1656

EF (1655-60), pp. 52,62; Shāhjahānāma, ff. 94b, 95a; Mirāt, I, p.234. In ~~184~~ 1653 he was dīvān of Āgra for few months, but was removed from the post for his covetuousness and made amin of Sambhar. Saʿdullāh Khān recommended

him for the *mutasaddīgarī*, of Sūrat. But from there too, he was soon removed and later on imprisoned on charges of embezzlement and irregularities, *Mirāt*, I, op.cit.

'ABDUL LATĪF - 1657

He administered the port on behalf of Princess Jahān Ārā, who then held the port in *jāgīr*. *Mirāt*, I, p.236.

SOME OF THE SERVANT OF PRINCE MURĀD - 1657

Prince Murād, after declaring himself Emperor at Ahmadābād, attacked Sūrat. He arrested 'Abdul Latif, the *mutasaddī*, and appointed one of his own servants in his place. *Mirāt* I, p. 236.

SĀDIQ MUHAMMAD KHĀN - 1658

Appointed by Aurangzeb, *Mirāt*, I, p.242.

MUHAMMAD AMĪN or AMĪNĀĪ GUJARĀTĪ - 1659

Appointed by Dārā, *Mirāt*, I, p. 242. During his one month and seven days stay at Ahmadābād twice the *mutasaddīs* for Sūrat were appointed by Dārā. But none of them probably succeeded in reaching Sūrat.

GUL MUHAMMAD - 1659

Appointed by Dārā. *Ibid.*, p. 245.

MIRZĀ 'ARAB - April 1659-Oct. 1660.

EF (1655-60), pp. 123&n, 198, 210, 230.

MUSTAFÁ KHĀN - Nov. 1660 - June 1663

[redacted]). *EF* (1655-60), p.330; Ibid., (1661-64), p.205; *'Ālamgīrnāma*, pp.471,606,765; *Mirāt*,I,pp.252,253. Removed from office on charges of corruption. His son used to act as customer at the customhouse of Sūrat *EF* (1661-64), pp. 203-204.

INAYAT KHĀN - June 1663-April 1664

(2000/2000 *Maāsir-al Umarā*,II,pp.813-818,*EF* (1661-64) pp. 203,205).
EF (1661-64), pp.205, 206,311,314; *'Ālamgīrnāma*, P.768. *Mirāt*, I, p.256. He was removed from office for his cowardly behaviour during Shivājis attack on Sūrat. When he was appointed *mutasaddi* he removed the entire old staff of the customhouse and appointed new men from amongst his favourites. See *EF* (1661-64) p.205. He was *mutasaddi* of both Sūrat & Cambay and had his *naibs* at both ports. MS. Frayser 124,f.74a.

GHIYĀSUDDĪN KHĀN - April 1664-1666 (1600-600 *'Ālamgīrnāma*, p.851). *EF* (1661-64), p.311; *Ibid.* (1665-67), p.282 & nl; *'Ālamgīrnāma*, *op.cit.*

MUHAMMAD BEG KHĀN - 1666-67

(1,000/600 *'Amal-i Sālih*, III, p.466). *EF* (1665-67), p. 282 & n.1.

GHIYĀSUDDĪN KHĀN - 1667 to 1668

(1,500-500, *'Ālamgīrnāma*, p.851). *EF* (1665-67), p.282 & n.1; *Ibid* (1668-69), p. 114 & n.3.

ZAIN-UL 'ĀBIDĪN KHĀN - Nov. 1668-69

(1000/300, 'Ālamgīrnāma, p.45). EF (1668-69), p.114 & n.1; 'Ālamgīrnāma, p.1057. Previously he was dīwān of Khāndesh Ibid.

ROSHAN ZAMĪR - 1669-Sept. 1670

(1500/500, 'Amal-i Sālih, I, p.617). EF (1668-69), p.198; Ibid.(1670-77), p. 193.

MIRZĀ SAIFULLĀH - Nov. 1670-Jan. 1672

EF (1670-77), pp. 193, 217.

GHIYĀSUDDĪN KHĀN - Jan. 1672-Nov. 1677

EF (1670-77), pp. 217, 283,284; Mirāt, I, p.293 . He was removed from office owing to his tyranny over the merchants. Mirzā Muázzam a leading merchant of Sūrat headed the deputation. See EF, op.cit.

KĀRTALAB KHĀN - Nov. 1677-Oct. 1684

Previously he was known as Muhammad Beg. In 1680 he was given the title of Kārtalab Khān,(Mirāt, I, p.293) and in 1688 Shujāát Khān. EF (1670-77), p. 284; Ibid., (1678-84), pp. 236, & n.2; 298 & n2; 340; Manucci, II, p.259; Mirāt, I, pp. 291,293,312, 314, 345; Akhbārāt, 14th Safar, 26th year of Aurangzeb. Kārtalab Khān held both faujdārī and mutasaddīgarī of Sūrat. Mirāt, I,p.312.

SALĀBAT KHĀN - Oct. 1684

EF (1678-84), p.340 & n.8; Mirāt, I, p.312. He also held the faujdārī of Sūrat. See Akhbārāt, document No. 2676, dated 26th Rabī I, 28th year 'Ālamgīrī. Ibid., document, 2543, dated 26 Safar, 28th year 'Ālamgīrī.

ḤĀJĪ FĀẒIL - 1684-85

Khāfī Khān, II, p.286.

MUʿTAMID KHĀN - 1685-86

Mirāt, I, p.315.

MUKHTĀR KHĀN - 1687 — ?

Mirāt, I, p.316. He was recalled to the court. Ibid., p.318.

IʿTIMĀD KHĀN - 1696-97

Mirāt, I, pp. 318, 333.

AMĀNAT KHĀN - 1697-99

Mirat, I, p.335; Manucci, III, p.490; Maʾāsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī, p. 412. Amānat Khān held both Dīwānī of Ṣūba Aḥmadābād and mutasaddīgarī of Sūrat, Mirāt, I, p.318.

DIYĀNAT KHĀN - 1699-1703

(2000/150 Maʾāsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī, p.461). Mirāt, I, p.342; Maʾāsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī, p.412; Akhbārāt, 9th Ramzan, 44th year of Aurangzeb. He was appointed mutasaddī in place of his brother Amānat Khān who died in 1699.

ITIBĀR KHĀN - 1703

Mirat, I, p.350. He remained in office only for a few months and was transferred for being inefficient *Ibid.*

NAJĀBAT KHĀN - 1703-1705

(2,500/1,000 *do-aspa* *Mir'āt*, I, p.350). *Mir'āt*, I, p.350. In 1705, for sometime Cambay was separated from Sūrat and Itimād 'Alī Khān was appointed *mutasaddī* at that port. See MS. Fraser 124, f. 75a.

AMĀNAT KHĀN - 1705-1711

He was *mutasaddī* both of Sūrat and Cambay. *Mir'āt*, I, p. 358. In 1711 he was transferred from Sūrat and appointed *amīn* and *faujdār* of *hawīlī* *pargana* Ahmadābād, Ibid., p.391.

In compiling this list, I am beholden to Mr. A.Jan Qaisar who kindly allowed me to use his notes.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Abbreviation Used:

Add.	: British Museum Additional Collection.
Or.	: British Museum Oriental Collection.
Bib. Ind.	: Bibliothica Indica.
MS.	: Manuscript.
Litho.	: Lithographed edition.
'Aligarh.	: Persian Manuscripts Section Maulānā Āzād Library 'Aligarh.
A.M.U. 'Aligarh	: 'Aligarh Muslim University, 'Aligarh.
IOL	: India Office Library.
R.A.S.	: The Library of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

ADMINISTRATIVE LITERATURE:

1. Abūl Fazl, Āīn-i Akbarī, 2 vols. ed. Blochmann, Bib.Ind. Calcutta (1867-77).

2. Yūsuf Mīrak, Mazhar-i Shāhjahānī, Vol. II, ed. Pīr Hisāmuddīn Rashidī, Karāchī, 1961.

3. Rāi Chandrabhan Brahman, Chār Chaman-i Brahman, MS. 'Abdūs Salām, 293, 'Alīgarh.

4. Dastūr-al 'Amal-i Navīsindagī, MS. Add. 6641, ff. 160-195.

5. Dastūr-al 'Amal-i 'Ālamgīrī , post 1658, MS. Add. 6599.

6. Jagat Rāi Shujā'ī Kāyath Saksena, Farhang-i Kārdānī, A.D. 1679, MS. 'Abdūs Salām, Fārsiya 85/315, 'Alīgarh.

7. Munshī Nand Rām Kāyasth Shrīvāstavya, Siyāqnāma, A.D. 1694-6. Litho, Nawal Kishor, Lucknow, 1879.

8. Khulāsatu-s Siyāq, A.D. 1703. MS. Sir S.Sulaimān 410/143 'Alīgarh.

9. Dastūr-al 'Amal-i Shāhjahānī, MS. Sir S.Sulaimān 676/53. Alīgarh.

10. Hidāyatullāh Bihārī, Hidāyat al Qawānīn, MS. 'Abdūs Salām 149/339, 'Alīgarh.

11. Jawāhar Nāth 'Bekās', Sahaswani, Dastūr-al 'Amal, A.D.1732, MS. Subhānullāh 954/4, 'Alīgarh.

12. Braj Rāi, Dastūr-al 'Amal-i Shahanshāhī (c. 1727), enlarged by Munshī Thākur Lāl (1776), MS. Add. 22831.

13. Dastūr-al 'Amal-i 'Ālamgīrī, 1659, MS. Add. 6598.

14. Yād-dāsht-i Mujmil-i Jama', 1646-47, MS. Add. 16863.

15. Chattar Mal, Dīvān Pasand, MS. Or. 2011.

16. Dastūr-al 'Amal-i Shāhjahānī wa Shuqqajāt-i 'Ālamgīrī, MS. Add. 6588.

17. Zawābit-i 'Ālamgīrī, MS. Or. 1641.

18. Dastūr-al-Amal-i Mumālik-i Mahrūsa-i Hindūstān, Aurangzeb, MS. Or. 1840.

19. Dastūr-al 'Amal, Aurangzeb, 1696 MS. Fraser 86, Bodleian Library Oxford.

20. Dastūr (Administration of Bengāl), MS. Add. 6586.

21. Kāghazāt-i Mutafarriq, Report in Persian on the pre-British system of administration in Bengāl, prepared by the Rāi Rāyān and the qānūngos under instructions of the Governor General and Council, January 4, 1777. MS. Add. 6586 ff. 53-a to 72b.

22. Dastūr-al Albāb fi 'Il-m Alhisāb, writer : anonymous, transcript copy of MS. Seminar Library, History Department, A.M.U. 'Alīgarh.

23. I'timād 'Alī Khān, Tasnif-i I'timād 'Alī Khān wald I'timād Khān har do 'Ālamgīrī - Iqbālnāma wa Akhbārnāma, MS. Fraser No. 124, Bodleian Library Oxford.

24. Dastūr-al 'Amal-i Mujmalāi, MS. Fārsiya 73, 'Alīgarh.

25. Lachhmi Narāin, Khulāsat-ul Hind, MS. Transcript, Seminar Library, History Department, A.M.U. 'Alīgarh.

26. Rāi Chandrabhān Brahman, 'Qawāid Sultanat-i Shāhjahānī', MS. Sir S. Sulaimān 666/44, 'Alīgarh.

27. 'Meenābāzār', MS. Sir S. Sulaimān F.H./312, 'Alīgarh.

28. Miscellaneous Papers relating to Bengāl, MS. Add. 19503.

29. 'Risāla-i Monasib', MS. Or. 1906.

30. 'Dastūr-al 'Amal', MS. IOL, No.370.

31. Chandrabhān Brahman, 'Guldasta-i Sultanaté', MS. 'Abdūs Salām 391/61, 'Alīgarh.

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORDS

1. Allāhābād Documents consist of farmāns, sale deeds, gift deeds, judgements, etc. and other documents concerning grants. A few of them belong to the 16th, while majority to 17th and 18th centuries. Following documents have been used: Nos. 83,141,213,290,291,296,503,519,820, 884-890,950,951,952,1106,1206,1268,1546,1861,1869,1880, 2080,2219,2296,2303,2305,2346,2408,2538,2554,2573,2610, 10704,10705,10708,10733,11104,11105,11106,11584,11592,

11735, 11751, 11774, 11921, 11986, 11989, 11990, 11993, 12115, 12276, 122784 & 12504. Preserved at state Archieves (U.P.) Allāhābād.

2. *Jaipūr Records* (in Persian) at State Archives Bikaner (Rajasthan).

i. *Farmāns* (1622-1711) 151 documents.

ii. *Nishān* (1622-1711) 142 documents.

iii. *Sanad* (1638-1765) 26 documents.

iv. *Vakīl Report* (Arzdāsht) or news-abstract from the Imperial court written by the *vakīls* of the Rājas of Amer and sent to the latter. In all, the documents number 1466 and date between 1667 to 1719. The documents for the years after 1707 are mixed up with those of the early years. I have used only those which date up to 1707.

v. *Khutūt Mahārājgān* or the letters, written by the imperial officials high and low and private persons, addressed to the Rājas of Amer. The documents number 3235 in all, bound up in 6 bundles and date between 1657-1719. I have used only those which bear date up to 1707.

vi. *Khutūt Ahlkārān* are letters written and addressed by one official to another. They are 1600 in number and date between 1625 to 1718. I have used only those dating upto 1707.

vii. *Mutafarriq Mahārājgān* or miscellaneous letters addressed to the Rājas of Amer. They are 5459 in number and date from 1665 to 1716.

viii. *Mutafarriq Ahlkārān* or miscellaneous letters addressed by one official to another. The number of documents is 3738. Out of which 1097 are undated while the rest date from 1607 to 1743. I have used only upto 1707.

The above documents from *Jaipūr Records* are cited both in *hijra* and regnal years at convenience and the numbers quoted alongwith the documents are archival which each of the document bears.

ix. *Akhbārāt-i Darbār-i Muallā*. The court bulletins or news-letters from the Imperial court, sent by the agents of the Rājas of Amer, containing brief accounts of daily occurrences at the Mughal *darbār* and reporting the main transactions publicly

contracted at the court for example the appointment of various officials, their promotion, demotion and transfer, news received from various provinces, income and expenditure and emperor's instructions and decisions on various problems of administration. The above *akhbārāt* in all consist of 17899 folios (at Bikāner). The *akhbārs* for the early years of Aurangzeb's reign have been mixed up with those of Bahādur Shāh's reign. However, from 9th regnal year (of Aurangzeb) onwards they are bound up separately in bundles one for each year. The bundles, which I have seen, contain *akhbārs* for the regnal years: 9,10,13,14,15,20,22,23,24,25,26, 27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44, 45,46,47,48,49,50,51. Besides the years, for which no *akhbārs* is available in the bundles, noted above, there are large number of gaps, for example, for 20th year only two folios are available. However, for most of the years noted above they are in complete sets. The *akhbārāts* for the years 39,44,48 are in transcribed form bound in volumes and therefore, in the thesis, they are cited with volumes and page nos. [redacted] For dates, both *hijra* and regnal years are cited at convenience. The numbers quoted along with the documents are archival.

I have also ak used some of the *akhbārs* for the early years of Bahādur Shāhs reign. The pattern of citation is same.

The *akhbārāt* also included x 9 volumes in case 47 at the Library R.A.S.London.

3. Copies of the *farmāns, nishāns and parwānas* issued in favour of the English East India Company, 1633-1712, MS. Add. 24039.

4. *Imperial Farmāns* (1577-1805), photographic reproduction of the original and their translations in English, Hindi and Gujarāti, with notes, by K.M.Jhaveri, Bombay, 1928.

5. *Selected Documents of Shāh Jahān's reign*, pub. by the *Daftar-i Dīwānī*, Hyderābād, Deccan, 1950.

6. *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's reign*, 1659-1706, ed. by Dr. Yūsuf Husain Khān, Hyderābād, 1958.

7. *Selected Waqāʾi of the Deccan (1660-1671)*, ed. by Dr.Yūsuf Husain Khān, Central Records Office Hyderābād, 1953.

8. *Daftar-i Dīwānī o Māl o Mulkī-i Sarkār-i ʿālá*, Hyderābād, 1939.

9. Shāhjahān, *Farmān* issued in favour of certain money-lenders. Text and tr. pub. in *IHRC*, Dec. 1942, pp.59-60.

10. *Waqāʼi-i Ranthembhor o Ajmer*, A.D. 1678-80. Āsafiya Library, Hyderābād, *Fan-i Tārikh*, 2242, transcript copy in Research Library, History Department, ʻAligarh Muslim University, Nos. 15 and 16, 2 vols.

11. Munshi Malikzāda, *Nigarnāma-i Munshi*, MS. ʻAbdūs Salām, 362/132 ʻAligarh.

12. *Durr-al ʻUlūm* by Sāhib Rāi Surdaj, A.D. 1688-89, MS. Bodl. Walker 104.

13. *Anfa-al-akhbār* by Muhammad Amin bin Daulat M. al Husaini (1626-7) MS. Or. 1761.

14. *Farāmin-i salātin*. Compiled and ed. by Bashir al-din Ahmad, Delhi 1926.

15. *Asnād-al Sanādid*, *Farmāns* and *sanads* of Akbar, Jahāngir, Shāhjahān, Aurangzeb etc. Compiled & ed. by Maulānā ʻAbdul Bāri Maāni, 1952.

16. Some *Farmāns*, *Sanad* and *Parwānas* (1578-1802) preserved in Bihar, calendared by K.K.Datta, Patna 1962.

17. *Sūrat Documents* 8 in number, Seminar Library, History Department, A.M.U. ʻAligarh. All are copies of the originals. Five of these I have used.

    i. *Dastak Dayānat Khān ʻAlamgiri*, issued to the mutasaddi of the custom house port Sūrat, dated 4th Ramzan, 46th regnal year ʻAlamgiri.

    ii. *Dastak Mukhtār Khān ʻĀlamgiri*, issued in the name of ʻAmala wa Faʻala dārulzarb, port Sūrat, dated 23rd Zilhijja, 32nd regnal year ʻĀlamgiri.

    iii. *Parwāna-i Tasdiq Itibār Khān ʻĀlamgiri*, issued to the mutasaddi port Sūrat, dated 7th Zilhijja, 46th regnal year ʻĀlamgiri.

    iv. *Dastak Itibār Khān ʻĀlamgiri*, issued in the name of ʻAmala wa Faʻala dārulzarb, port Sūrat, dated ~~14th Rajab, 7th year of~~ is worm eaten.

    v. *Parwāna-i Tasdiq Muāfi Qamaruddin Khān Muhammad Shāhi*, issued to the mutasaddi, port Sūrat, dated 14th Rajab, 7th year of Muhammad Shāh.

18. Manik Chand, *Ahwāl-i Shaher-i Akbarābād*, MS. Or. 2030.

19. Shamsābād Documents, Seminar Library, History Department, A.M.U.'Aligarh.

20. 'Majmū' -i Farāmin-i 'Ālamgir (Aurangzeb), MS. Fraser 228, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

21. Corpus Inscription Bhāvnagari, being A Selection of Arabic and Persian Inscription, collected by Antiquarian Department Bhāvnagar State Bombay, 1889.

22. Shaikh Ghulām Hasin Saddiqi al Farshūri, 'Sharāif Ushmāni, MS. 110, Seminar Library, History Department, A.M.U. 'Aligarh.

23. B.N.Goswamy and J.S.Grewal, The Mughals and the Jogis of Jakhbar, Simla, 1967.

COLLECTION OF LETTERS

1. Abūl Fazl, 'Inshā-i Abūl Fazl', Litho. ed. Nawal Kishor, Kanpur, 1872.

2. Khānazād Khān, 'Inshā-i Khānazād Khān, MS. Or. 1410.

3. Letters written on behalf of Saif Khān, collected in 1641. MS. Subhānullāh, Fārsiya, 891.5528/15, 'Aligarh.

4. Ādāb-i 'Ālamgiri, MS. 'Abdūs Salām, 326/96. 'Aligarh.

5. Ruqāt-i 'Ālamgiri, ed. Saiyid Najib Ashraf Nadvi, A'zmagarh. 1930.

6. Bālkrishna Barhaman, Letters of Shaikh Jalāl Hisāri and Bālkrishna Barhman MS. Add. 16859.

7. Munshi Bhagchand, Jāmi-al Inshā, MS. Or. 1702.

8. Bhupat Rāi, Inshā-i Roshan Kalām, MS. 'Abdūs Salām, 339/109, 'Aligarh.

9. Aurangzeb, Raqāim-i Karāim, MS. Sir Sulaimān, 412/145, 'Aligarh.

10. Aurangzeb, Kalimāt-i Taiyabāt, Collection of letters by Ināyatullāh Khān, MS. 'Abdūs Salām, 322/92, 'Aligarh.

11. Dastūr al-Amal-i Agāhi, MS. 'Abdūs Salām, 323/93. 'Aligarh.

12. *Ahkām-i 'Ālamgīrī*, MS. IOL, 3887.

13. Muhammad Ja'far Qādirī, *Inshā-i Ajib*, Lithio, ed., by Nawal Kishore, Kānpūr, 1912.

14. Collection of Letters - Akbar to Aurangzeb, MS. IOL, 2678.

15. Abūl Qāsim Khān, *Munshāt-al Namakīn*, MS. IOL 1535.

16. Hindū, *Kārnāma-i-Wāqia*, MS. IOL, 2027.

HISTORICAL WORKS (PERSIAN)

1. Babur, *Bāburnāma*, Persian tr. by 'Abdur Rahīm Khān-i Khānān, MS. Or. 3174, and English tr. By A.S.Beveridge, London, 1921.

2. Mihtar Jauhar, *Tazkirāt-al Wāqiāt*, MS. Add., 16711.

3. Bāyazid Bayāt, *Tazkira-i Humāyūn o Akbar*, ed. M.Hidāyat Husain, Bib.Ind. Calcutta, 1941.

4. 'Ārif Qandahārī, *Tārīkh-i Akbarī*, MS. Razā Library Rāmpūr.

5. Nizām-u-ddīn Ahmad, *Tabaqāt-i Akbarī*, ed. B.De, Bib.Ind. 3 vols. Calcutta, 1913, 1927, 1931.

6. 'Abdul Qādir Badāonī, *Muntakhabut Tawārīkh*, ed. 'Alī Ahmad and Lees, Bib.Ind., Calcutta, 1864-69.

7. Abūl Fazl, *Akbarnāma*, Bib.Ind. 3 vols, Calcutta, 1873-87.

8. Mīr Masūm, *Tārīkh-i Sind*, ed. U.M. Daudpota, Poona, 1938.

9. Asad Beg Qazwīnī, *Ahwāl-i Asad Beg*, MS. Add. 30776.

10. 'Abdul Bāqī Nihāwandī, *Maāsir-i Rahīmī*, Bib.Ind. 3 vols. Calcutta, 1910-31.

11. Jahāngīr, *Tuzuk-i-Jahāngīrī*, ed. Sir Saiyid Ahmad, Ghazipur, and 'Alīgarh 1863-64.

12. 'Alāuddīn Ghaibī Isfahānī Mirzā Nāthan, *Bahāristān-i Ghaibī*, tr. Borah, 2 vols., Gauhātī, 1936.

13. Mu'tamad Khān, *Iqbālnāma-i Jahāngīrī*, Lucknow Litho. ed. Nawal Kishor, 1870.

14. Kāmgār Husainī, *Maāsir-i-Jahāngīrī*, MS. Or. 171.

15. Anonymous, Intikhāb-i Jahāngir Shāhī, MS. Or. 1648.

16. Amīn Qazwīnī, Pādshāhnāma, MS. Raza Library, Rāmpūr.

17. 'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī, Pādshāhnāma, 2 vols. Bib.Ind. Calcutta, 1866-72.

18. Muhammad Wāris, Pādshāhnāma, MS. Add. 6556.

19. Muhammad Sādiq Khān Shāhjahānnāma, MS. Or. 174.

20. Sālih Kanbu Lāhorī, 'Amal-i Sālih, ed. G.Yazdānī, 4 vols. Bib.Ind. Calcutta, 1912-46.

21. Muhammad Kāzim, 'Ālamgīrnāma, ed. Khādim Husain and 'Abdul Hāi, Bib.Ind., Calcutta, 1865-73.

22. Shaikh Muhammad Baqā Baqā, Mirāt-al Ālam, MS. 'Abdus Salam, 84/314, 'Aligarh.

23. Mehta Isardās Nāgar, Futūhāt-i 'Ālamgīrī, MS. Add. 23884.

24. Sujān Rāi Bhandarī, Khulāsatut Tawārīkh, ed. Zafar Hasan, Delhi, 1918.

25. Abūl Fazl Memurī, continuation of Shāhjahānnāma, MS. Or. 1671.

26. Bhimsen, Nuskha-i Dilkushā, MS. Or. 23.

27. Saqi Musta'idd Khān, Ma'āsir-i 'Ālamgīrī, Bib.Ind. Calcutta, 1870-73.

28. Jagjivandās Gujarātī, Muntakhabut Tawārīkh, MS. Add. 26253.

29. Muhammad Hāshim Khāfī Khān, Muntakhab-al Lubāb, ed. K.D.Ahmad and Haig, Bib.Ind.Calcutta, 1860-74, 1909-25.

30. 'Alī Muhammad Khān, Mirāt-i Ahmadī, ed. Nawāb 'Alī, 2 vols. & Supplement, Baroda, 1927-28, 1930.

31. Shāh Nawāz Khān, Ma'āsir-al Umarā, ed. 'Abdur Rahim and Ashraf 'Alī, Bib.Ind., 3 vols, Calcutta, 1888-91.

32. Inayatullāh Kambo Lāhorī, Tārīkh-i Dilkushā, MS. Browne, Suppl. 234 Kings, Cambridge University.

33. Sidhārī Lāl, Tuhfa-i Shāhjahānī, MS. IOL 337.

34. Muhammad Sādiq Dehlvī, Akhbār-i Jahāngīrī, MS. Browne Suppl. 23 Kings 6, Cambridge University.

35. Tughlaq Beg Kāllālī, Nushka-i Ahvāl-i Shāhī, MS. Or.3203.

36. Sikander bin Muhammad Manjhū Akbar, Mirāt-i Sikandarī, ed. S.C.Misra & M.L. Rahmān, Baroda, 1961.

37. Abū Tūrāb Valī, Tārikh-i Gujerāt, ed. Sir Denison Ross, Calcutta, 1909.

38. M.Salīmullāh, Tārikh-i Bengala, MS. transcript copy, Seminar Library, History Department, A.M.U.'Aligarh.

39. Khair-uddīn Allāhābādī, Balwant Nāma, MS. IOL, Ethe,483.

40. 'Aliuddin, Ibratnāma, MS. IOL, 3241.

41. Rāi Bindrāban, Lubbut Tawārīkh-i Hind, MS. Farsiya, 190, Aligarh.

42. 'Kitab-ul Ikhtivār, MS. Add. 22714.

43. Tazkira-i 'Ulamā-Hind, by Moulawī Rahman Alī, Lucknow 1914.

44. Ziyāuddīn Barnī, Tārikh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, ed. Sayid Ahmad Khān, Bib.Ind., Calcutta, 1862.

45. Sham Sirāj Afif, Tārikh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, ed. Wilāyat Husain, Bib.Ind., Calcutta, 1891.

46. Ghulām Muhammad Khān, Travels in Upper Hindustān, IOL Ethe, 654.

47. Ghulām Husain Khān Tabātabāi, Siyār-ul Mutākhirin, 3 vols, Nawal Kishor, Lucknow.

48. S.Muhammad Wali Ullāh, Tārikh-i Farrukhābād, MS. Subhanullāh 954/1, Aligarh.

49. 'Aqil Khān Rāzī, Wāqi'āt-i 'Alamgiri, ed. Zafar Hasan, 'Aligarh, 1946.

TOPOGRAPHICAL WORKS

1. Rāi Chaturman Saksena, Chahār Gulshan, MS. Bodleian Library Oxford, Elliot 366. Portion tr. by Sarkar, in his 'India of Aurangzeb, Calcutta 1901.

2. Amin Ahmad Razi, Haft Iqlim, ed. by Ross, Harley & Haqq, Calcutta, 1918, 27 & 39.

3. 'Abdul Latif, Journey to Bengal 1608-9, tr. by J.Sarkar, Bengal Past & Present, Vol. XXXV, Part II, (1928), pp. 143-46.

4. Aminuddin Khān, Ma'lūmāt-al Āfāq, A.D. 1707-13 MS. Subhānullāh 362/124, Aligarh.

5. 'Ānand Rām Mukhlis, Safarnāma-i Mukhlis, ed. by S.'Azhar 'Alī, Rampur, 1946.

WORKS IN HINDI AND URDU

1. Banarsī Dās Jain, 'Ardhā Kathānak, ed. by N.R.Premī, Bombay, 1957.

2. Kavirāj Shyāmal Dās, Vīr Vinod, 4 vols.

3. Muhammad Husain Āzād, Darbār-i Akbarī, Nawal Kishor, Lāhore, 1910.

4. Kuar Lachman Singh, Memoir of Zila Bulandshahr, Allāhābād 1874.

5. Fatāwā-i 'Ālamgīrī, Urdu tr. 4 vols. by Sayyid Amīr 'Alī, Lucknow, 1889.

DICTIONARIES AND GLOSSARIES USED

1. Lisān al 'Arab, Bairut, 1955.

2. Munshī Tekchand Behār, Bahār-i 'Ajam, A.D. 1739-40, 2 vols. Nawal Kishor 1916.

3. 'Abdur Rashid al-Tattawī, Farhang-i Rashīdī, ed. Abū Tāhir Zūlfiqār 'Alī Murshidābādī, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1875.

4. 'Ānand Rām Mukhlis, Mirāt-al Istilāh, a glossary of technical terms, A.D. 1745, MS. Anjuman Taraqqī Urdū Library, 'Aligarh.

5. Jamāl Husain Injū, Farhang-i Jahāngīrī, A.D. 1608-9. Pub. Samar-i Hind Press Lucknow, 1876.

6. Khwāja Yāsīn, Glossary of revenue and administrative terms, MS. Add. 6603. I have also used Purnea MS. Patna - Copy in Seminar Library, History Deptt. A.M.U. Aligarh.

7. F.Steingass, A Comprehensive Persian English Dictionary.

8. H.H.Wilson, A Glossary of Judicial and revenue terms, London, 1875.

9. Hobson Jobson, A Glossary - ed. William Crooke.

10. Belsaris Gujarātī Dictionary.

EUROPEAN SOURCES (ENGLISH)

1. Father A.Monserrate, Commentary on his Journey to the Court of Akbar, tr. J.S.Hoyland and annotated by S.N. Banerjee, Cuttack, 1922.

2. Father A.Monserrate, 'Information de los X'pianos de S.Thoma, 1579, tr. H.Hosten, JASB, NS., XVIII, 1922, pp. 349-69.

3. J.H.Van Linschoten, The Voyage of John Huyghen Van Linschoten to the East Indies, ed. A.C.Burnell Vol.I and P.A.Tiele Vol.II, Hakluyt Society, Vols. 70-71, London 1885.

4. Early Travels, ed. W.Foster, London, 1927, Collection of narratives of Fitch, Mildenhall, Hawkins, Finch, Withington, Coryat and Terry.

5. Ralph Fitch, Narrative, ed. J.H.Ryley, Ralph Fitch England's Pioneer to India and Burma, London, 1899.

6. (i) Caesar Frederick, 'Extracts of His Eighteen Years Indian Observations' (A.D. 1563-81), Purchase his Pilgrims, pub. Maclehose, Glasgow, 1905, X, pp.88-143.

(ii) C.Frederick, The Voyage of Master Caesar Frederick into the east India, and beyonde the Indies, Anno 1563, Pub. The Principal Navigations Voyage Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation, by R.Hakluyt, Vol. III (1926), London, pp.198-269. References to C.Frederick are from both the books.

7. A Supplementary Calendar of Documents in the India Office Relating to India or to the Home Affairs of the East India Company, 1600-1640, by W.Foster, London, 1928.

8. Letters Received, 6 vols, (1602-17), Vol.I, ed. Danvers, Vols. 2 to 6, ed. W.Foster, London, 1896-1902.

9. John Jourdain, Journal, 1608-17, ed. W.Foster, Hakluyt Society, 2nd Series, No.XVI, Cambridge 1905.

10. Joseph Salbancke, '<u>Voyage</u>', 1609, Purchas, III, pp.82-89.

11. Peter Floris, <u>His Voyage to the East Indies in the 'Globe'</u>, 1611-15. ed. Moreland, Hakluyt Society, 2nd Series LXXIV, London, 1934.

12. Thomas Roe, <u>The Embassy</u>, 1615-19, ed. W.Foster, London, 1926.

13. Richard Steel and John Crowther, '<u>Journall</u>', 1615-16, Purchas, IV, pp. 266-80.

14. <u>The English Factories In India</u>, 1618-69, ed. W.Foster, 13 Vols. Oxford, 1906-27. The vols. are not cited by numbers but by years which they cover.

15. Fr.J.Xavier, <u>Letters</u>, 1593-1617, tr. Hosten, <u>JASB</u>, NS. XXIII, 1927, pp. 109-30.

16. Pietro Della Valle, <u>The Travels of Pietro Della Valle in India</u>, tr. Edward Grey, Hakluyt Society, 2 vols, London, 1892.

17. Pieter Van Den Broeke, <u>Surat 'Diary</u>', 1620-29, tr. Moreland, JIH, X, pp. 235-50; XI, pp. 1-16, 203-18.

18. F.Pelsaert, <u>Remonstrantie</u>, tr. Moreland and Geyl, '<u>Jahangir's India</u>, Cambridge, 1925.

19. Peter Mundy, <u>Travels</u>, Vol.II, <u>Travel in Asia</u>, 1630-34, ed. Sir R.C.Temple, Hakluyt Society, 2nd Series, XXXV, London, 1914.

20. F.S.Manrique, <u>Travels</u>, 1629-43, tr. C.E. Luard, 2 vols. Hakluyt Society, 1927.

21. John Van Twist, '<u>A General Description of India</u>', 1638, extracts tr. Moreland, <u>JIH</u>, XVI (1937), pp. 63-77.

22. J.B.Tavernier, '<u>Travels in India</u>, 1640-67, tr. V.Ball, 2nd. ed. revised by W.Crooke, London, 1925.

23. F.Bernier, '<u>Travels in Mogul Empire 1656-68</u>, tr. by A.Constable, 2nd edition revised by V.A.Smith, London, 1916.

24. Jean de Thevenot, '<u>Relation de l'Indostan</u>, 1666-67, Lovells tr. Reprinted with notes and introduction by S.N.Sen in '<u>The Indian Travels of Thevenot and Careri</u>, New Delhi, 1949.

25. John Marshall, '<u>Notes and Observations on East India</u>', ed. S.A.Khan, <u>John Marshall in India - Notes and Observation in Bengal</u>, 1668-72, London, 1927.

26. Thomas Bowrey, '*A Geographical Account of Countries Round the Bay of Bengal*, 1669-1679, ed. R.C.Temple, Cambridge, 1905.

27. John Fryer, *A New Account of East India and Persian being Nine years Travels*, ~~XX~~ 1672-81, 3 vols. ed. W.Crooke.

28. S.Master, *The Diaries*, 2 vols. ed. R.C.Temple, Indian Records Series, London, 1911.

29. William Hedges, *The Diary of William Hedges*, ed. H.Yule, 3 vols. London, 1887-1889.

30. J.Ovington, *A Voyage to Surat in the Year* 1689, ed. H.G.Rawlinson, London, 1929.

31. G.F.G.Careri, '*Giro del Mondo*, Portion relating to India reprinted in *The Indian Journals of Thevenot and Careri*, ed. S.N. Sen, New Delhi, 1949.

32. Nicolao Manucci, *Storia do Mogor*, 1656-1712, tr. W.Irvine, 4 vols. London, 1907-8.

33. *The English Factories in India* (New Series), ed. Sir Charles Fawcett, Oxford, 1936.

34. D.Barbosa, *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, 2 vols. tr. M.L.Dames, London, 1921.

35. Varthema, '*Itinerary Through Southern Asia*, tr. R.C. Temple, London, 1928.

36. Fernao Guerreiro, *Relations*, Portion tr. C.H.Payne, *Jahangir and the Jesuits*, London, 1930.

37. '*Relations of Golconda in the Early Seventeenth Century*, a collection of the 'relations' of Methwold, Schorer and an anonymous Dutch factor. ed. & tr. W.H. Moreland, Hakluyt Society, London, 1931.

38. '*Akbar and the Jesuits*, an account of the Jesuit Missions to the court of Akbar by Father Pierre Du Jurric, tr. C.H.Rayne, ed. by Sir E.Denison Ross and Eileen Power.

39. Thomas Best, *The Voyage of Thomas Best to the East Indies* (1612-13), London, 1934.

40. Carre de Chambon, *The Travels of the Abbe Carre in India and Near East*, 1672-74, 3 vols. London, 1947-1948.

41. *A Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, 5 vols. Calcutta, 1930.

42. Nicolo Conti, The Travels of Nicolo Conti, London, 1857.

43. Nicholas Dawnton, The Voyage of Nicholas Dawnton to the East Indies (1614-1615), London, 1812.

44. English Records on Shivaji (1659-1682), Poona, 1931.

45. A Hamilton, A New Account of the East Indies, digested into 'Voyages and Travels' (1688-1723) by J.Pinkerton, London 1811, Vol. VIII. All references to Hamilton are to this volume.

46. Martin R.Montgomery, The History, Antiquities, Topography and Statistics of Eastern India, Comprising Districts of Bihar, Shahabad, Bhagalpur.

47. J.Olafsson, The Life of the Icelander Jan Olafsson, Traveller to India, written by Himself and Completed about 1661 A.D., 2 vols. London, 1923, 1932.

48. R.Steel, J.Crowther, A Journal of the Journey of Richard Steel and John Crowther to the East Indies (1615-1616) 4 vols. 1905.

49. The Surat Factory Outward Letter Book, Vol.II, 1663-71/72 in the Department of Archives and Archaeology, Bombay.

50. De Laet, Description of India and Fragment of Indian History, tr. J.S.Hoyland and annotated by S.N.Banerjee : The Empire of the Great Mogol, Kitab Mahal, Bombay,1928.

51. A.D. Albuquerque, The Commentaries do Grande Afonso de Albuquerque, tr. by Walter de Gray Birch, 4 vols. Hakluyt Society, London, 1875, 1884.

52. T.Pires, The Suma Oriental of Tome Pires, An Account of the East from the Red sea to Japan, Written in Malacca and India in 1512-1515, Vol.I, London, 1944.

53. T.Herbert, Some Years Travels into Divers parts of Asia and Afrique, London, 1638.

54. W.Fostern and others, 'The Court Minutes of the East India Company', Oxford, 1907-38.

55. Mandelslo's Travels in Western India (A.D. 1638-39), by M.S.Commissariat, Oxford University Press, 1931, All references to Mandelslo are to this work.

56. A Calendar of the court of Minutes of the East India Company ed. by E.B.Sainsbury, Vol. 1-10, Oxford, 1907-1935.

57. Elkington's notes, Supplementary Calendar of Documents in the India Office, by W.Foster, London, 1928.

MODERN WORKS

Administrative:

1. J.Sarkar, Mughal Administration, Calcutta, 1920.

2. W.Irvine, The Army of the Indian Mughals, London, 1903.

3. P.Saran, Provincial Government of the Mughals (1526-1658), Allahabad, 1941.

4. Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1556-1707), Asia, 1963.

5. M.Athar Ali, The Mughal Nobility Under Aurangzeb, Asia, 1966.

6. N.A.Siddiqi, Land Revenue Administration Under the Mughals, Asia, 1970.

Economic:

7. W.H.Moreland, India at the Death of Akbar, London, 1920.

8. W.H.Moreland, From Akbar to Aurangzeb, London, 1923.

9. Edward Thomas, Revenue Resources of the Mughal Empire in India, (1593-1707), London, 1871.

10. J.Sarkar, India of Aurangzeb, Calcutta, 1901.

11. K.N.Chaudhuri, The Development of the English East India Company with special reference to its trade and Organisation (1600-1640).

12. B.K.Sarkar, Inland Transport and Communication, Calcutta, 1925.

13. K.Glamann, Dutch-Asiatic Trade (1620-1740), The Hague/Copenhagen, 1958.

14. Y.Takekoshi, The Economic Aspects of the History of the Civilization of Japan, London, 1930.

15. L.C.Jain, Indigenous Banking in India, London 1929.

16. V.I.Lenin, 'The Development of Capitalism in Russia, Collected works, 3 vols. Moscow, 1964.

17. V.I.Pavlov, The Indian Capitalist Class, Delhi, 1964.

18. A.I.Chicherov, Indian Economic Development in 16th & 18th centuries, Moscow, 1971.

19. H.K.Naqvi, Urban Centres and Industries in Upper India (1556-1803), Asia, 1968.

20. T.Raychaudhuri, Jan Company in Coromandel (1605-1690) S.Gravenhage, 1962.

21. Contributions to Indian Economic History - 1, ed. by T.Raychaudhuri, Calcutta, 1960, for Irfan Habibs 'Banking in Mughal India', pp. 1-20.

22. K.Marx, 'Capital', Vol.I, Moscow, 1965.

23. K.Marx, 'Capital', Vol. 3, Moscow, 1966.

24. Marx and Engels, 'Selected Works', 2 vols. Moscow, 1949-50.

25. M.Dobb, Studies in the Development of Capitalism, London, 1946.

26. K.Marx, 'Pre-Capitalist Economic Formation', ed. E.J. Hobsbawm (1964), London.

Numismatic:

27. S.H.Hodivala, Historical Studies in Mughal Numismatic, Calcutta, 1923.

28. R.B.Whitehead, Catalogue of the Coins of the Mughal Emperors in the Panjab Museum, Lahore, Oxford 1914.

29. F.Leggett, Notes on the Mint Towns and Coins of the Muhammadans from the Earliest Period to the Present Time, London, 1885.

30. M.K.Hussain, Catalogue of Coins of the Mughal Emperors, Bombay, 1968.

31. C.J.Rodgers, The Coins of the Mughal Emperors of India, Calcutta, 1893.

32. G.H.Khare, *Mandolātil Nāṇī* (in Marāthī), Bharat Itihasa Samshodak Mandal, Poona, 1933.

33. H.N.Wright, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, Vol.III, Part I, (Mughal Emperors of India) Oxford, 1908.

34. Stanley Lane - Poole, *The Coins of the Mughal Emperors of Hindustan in the British Museum*, ed. Reginald Stuart Poole, London, 1892.

35. Alexander Cunningham, *Coins of Medieval India*, Delhi, 1967.

36. D.C.Sircar, *Studies in Indian Coins*, Delhi, 1968.

37. Abdul Karim, *Corpus of the Muslim Coins of Bengal*, Dacca, 1960.

38. G.B.Rawlings, *Ancient Medieval Modern Coins*, Chicago, 1966.

39. C.R.Singhal, *Supplementary Catalogue of Mughal Coins in the state Museum*, Lucknow, 1965.

Islamic Law and Jurisprudence:

40. '*Encyclopaedia of Islam*' ed. Th.M. Houtsma, 1913-1934.

41. *Supplement to the Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1938.

42. T.P.Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, London, 1935.

43. G.Snouck Hurgronje, *Muhammadanism* (Lectures on its origin, its religions and political growth and its present state), London, 1916.

44. *Mohammad, Maalim-al Qarba*, ed. by Levy with extracts in English.

45. Joseph Schacht, *Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*, Oxford 1950.

46. Gaudfroy - Demombynes, *Muslim Institutions*, London,1950.

47. Gibb and Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West*, Ist Vol. Oxford, 1951.

48. Charles Hamilton, The Hidāyah 2n ed. ed. by S.G.Grady, London, 1870.

49. D.B.Macdonold, Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory, Ist ed. New York, 1903.

50. N.Baillie, Digest of Muhammadan Law.

Political and General:

51. J.Sarkar, History of Aurangzeb, 5 vols. Calcutta, 1912.

52. J.Sarkar, Anecdotes of Aurangzeb, Calcutta, 1925.

53. M.S.Commissariat, A History of Gujarāt, 2 vols. Orient Longmans, 1957.

54. W.Irvine, 'Later Mughals', 2 vols. Calcutta, 1922.

55. B.P.Saksena, History of Shāhjahān of Delhi, Allahabad 1958.

56. Muhammad Baqir, Lāhore Past and Present, Lahore, 1952.

57. Ibn Khaldun, The Muqddema, An Introduction to History, tr. F.Rosenthal, London, 1958.

58. D.D.Kosambi, An Introduction to the Study of Indian History, Bombay, 1956.

59. W.Irvine, The Bangash Nawābs of Farrukhābād, JASB, No.IV, 1878, Calcutta, 1879.

60. District Gazetteers issued by Provincial Governments. I have consulted the gazetteers of the districts of Gujarat.

61. Al Berunī, Kitāb-ul Hind, tr. Sachau, London, 1914.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.
1920, pp. 517-533 : W.H.Moreland, 'The Shāhbandar in the Eastern Sea.'

Journal of the (Royal) Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. Vol.XVII, No.I, (New Series) 1921, pp.31-97 : S.H.Hodivala, 'Historical Notes on the Honorific Epithets of Mughal Mint Towns.'

Enquiry - Delhi.
New Series, Vol.III, No.3 (Old Series No. 15) Winter 1971, pp. 1-56 : Irfan Habib, 'Potentialities of Capitalistic Development in the Economy of Mughal India.'

Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient - Leiden, Netherlands, pp. 187-197: Vol.XII, Part I, January 1969, pp. 187-197: B.G.Gokhale, 'Ahmadābād in the XVIIth Century'.

Medieval India Quarterly - Aligarh.
Vol.IV (1961), pp. 1-21 : Irfan Habib, 'The Currency System of the Mughal Empire ' (1556-1707).

Indian Historical Records Commission, Vol.XXXVI, Part III, 1961, Chandigarh, p.59. B.R.Grover, 'Hasba Bandi Document'.

The Indian Economic and Social Historical Review - Delhi.
Vol.6, No.I (1969), pp. 85-116 : Aziza Hasan, 'Silver Currency Output of the Mughal Empire'.
Vol.7, No.I (1970) pp. 140-146 : Om Prakash and J.Krishnamurty, 'Mughal Silver Currency - A Critique.'

Quarterly Review of Historical Studies - Calcutta.
Vol.X (1970-71) No.2, pp. 79-90 : M.P.Singh, The Custom and the Custom House at Sūrat in the Seventeenth Century.'

Studies in Islam - New Delhi.
January - October, 1971, pp. 132-164 : M.P.Singh, The Custom House at the Port of Sūrat During the Seventeenth Century, including the text and tr. of two persian documents known as Sūrat Documents.

Numismatic Supplement to the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Nos. used from 1, issued 1904, to XLVII, 1937-38.

Journal of the Numismatic Society of India.
Vols. used from I, issued 1939, to XXXI, 1971.

Medieval India a miscellany - Aligarh.
Vol.I, Asia, 1969., Vol.II, Asia, 1972.

Other Journals Consulted:

Journal of the Royal Asiatic society Bombay Branch, Bombay.

Journal of Indian History Trivandrum.

Proceeding of the Indian History Congress, Annual Session.

Islamic Culture, Hyderābād.

Ma'ārif, A'zamgarh.

Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, Karāchī.

Journal of the Sind Historical Society, Karāchī.